DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 391 962 CE 070 881

AUTHOR Dench, S.; And Others
TITLE The Recruitment and Retention of People with Disabilities. Report 301.
INSTITUTION Sussex Univ., Brighton (England). Inst. for Employment Studies.
SPONS AGENCY Department for Education and Employment, London (England).
REPORT NO ISBN-1-85184-227-6
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 162p.
AVAILABLE FROM BEBC Distribution, 15 Albion Close, Parkstone, Poole BH12 3LL, England, United Kingdom.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; Developed Nations; *Disabilities; Disability Discrimination; *Employer Attitudes; Employment Patterns; *Employment Practices; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Foreign Countries; *Labor Turnover; *Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS *Great Britain

ABSTRACT

A British survey of employers examined the recruitment and retention of people with disabilities (PWDs). Telephone interviews were conducted with two samples of employers: a random sample of 1,250 and a sample of 250 registered users of the Employment Service's "Disability Symbol," which sets a good practice standard for the employment of PWDs. Findings indicated that more than 90 percent of employers with any disabled employees employed 5 or fewer. The two most common reasons for not having any disabled employees were that none had applied for a job or that a person with disabilities had been employed but had subsequently left. Forty-five percent of the symbol users sampled had a policy specifically addressing the employment of PWDs; only 17 percent of the random sample had a policy. There was a direct relationship between the size of establishment and the existence of written policy. Almost 71 percent of symbol users and 11 percent of the random sample were actively trying to attract applications from persons with disabilities; almost 40 percent of respondents reported difficulty in attracting such applications. People with difficulties in seeing or with mental handicaps/learning difficulties were hardest to employ. The main perceived problem related to the nature of the work. Almost all symbol users were prepared to make costless or minor changes to work environment; 84 percent were willing to pay for necessary adaptations or alterations. Eleven percent of symbol users did not seem aware of its existence. (Appendixes include the sampling design and characteristics, reanalysis of a previous survey, and questionnaire.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 391 962

IES

THE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

S Dench, N Meager, S Morris

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A Davidson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE070881

THE INSTITUTE FOR EMPLOYMENT STUDIES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

Other titles from IES:

Winners and Losers: Funding Issues for the Training of People with Special Training Needs,
N Meager
IES Report 298, 1995. ISBN 1-85184-224-1.

Employers; Attitudes Towards People with Disabilities,
S Honey, N Meager, M Williams
IES Report 245, 1993. ISBN 1-85184-168-7.

A catalogue of these and over 100 other titles is available from IES.

THE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

S Dench, N Meager, S Morris

THE INSTITUTE FOR EMPLOYMENT STUDIES Report 301

Published by:

THE INSTITUTE FOR EMPLOYMENT STUDIES
Mantell Building
University of Sussex
Brighton BN1 9RF
UK

Tel. + 44 (0) 1273 686751
Fax + 44 (0) 1273 690430

Copyright © 1996 The Institute for Employment Studies

No part of this publication may be reproduced or used in any form by any means — graphic, electronic or mechanical including photocopying, recording, taping or information storage or retrieval systems — without prior permission in writing from the Institute for Employment Studies.

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors, and not necessarily those of the Department for Education and Employment.

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 1-85184-227-6

Printed in Great Britain by Microgen UK Ltd

The Institute for Employment Studies

The Institute for Employment Studies is an independent, international centre of research and consultancy in human resource issues. It has close working contacts with employers in the manufacturing, service and public sectors, government departments, agencies, professional and employee bodies, and foundations. Since it was established 25 years ago the Institute has been a focus of knowledge and practical experience in employment and training policy, the operation of labour markets and human resource planning and development. IES is a not-for-profit organisation which has a multidisciplinary staff of over 50. IES expertise is available to all organisations through research, consultancy, training and publications.

IES aims to help bring about sustainable improvements in employment policy and human resource management. IES achieves this by increasing the understanding and improving the practice of key decision makers in policy bodies and employing organisations.

Formerly titled the Institute of Manpower Studies (IMS), the Institute changed its name to the *Institute for Employment Studies* (IES) in Autumn 1994, this name better reflecting the full range of the Institute's activities and involvement.

Contents

Executive Summary	**1**
1. Introduction	**11**
1.1 Background and objectives of the study	11
1.2 The programmes covered by this study	12
1.3 Methodology	14
1.4 Structure of the report	17
2. The Employment of People with Disabilities	**19**
2.1 Introduction	19
2.2 Employers employing people with disabilities	19
2.3 Employers not employing people with disabilities	26
2.4 Summary	30
3. Policies Towards the Employment of People with Disabilities	**32**
3.1 The existence of policies	32
3.2 The coverage of policies	36
3.3 Some additional practices	36
3.4 Summary	46
4. Perceptions of and Attitudes Towards People with Disabilities	**48**
4.1 Perceptions of the employability of people with different disabilities	48
4.2 Why are people with some disabilities seen as difficult to employ?	52
4.3 Summary	56
5. Making Accommodation for Disabled Staff	**58**
5.1 Preparedness to accommodate disabled staff	58
5.2 Willingness to pay to accommodate disabled staff	60
5.3 Willingness to pay for accommodation for existing employees	64
5.4 Summary	67
6. Employer use of Information/Advice Sources on Disability	**68**
6.1 Awareness of and contact with main information/ advice sources	68

6.2 Other sources of advice, information and assistance 71
6.3 Contact with PACTs, DEAs *etc.* 73
6.4 Employer use of Access to Work and Special Schemes 76
6.5 Participation in employer disability networks 78
6.6 Summary 85

7. Symbol Users **87**

7.1 Summary of earlier findings about Symbol users 87
7.2 Awareness and extent of use 88
7.3 Reasons for not being signed up to Symbol use 91
7.4 Reasons for making the commitment 92
7.5 Practices associated with Symbol use 93
7.6 Does being a Symbol user make a difference? 99
7.7 Difficulties experienced and changes desired 101
7.8 Summary 102

Appendix 1: Sampling Design and Characteristics **104**

Appendix 2: Previous IES survey — re-analyses **110**

Appendix 3: Telephone Questionnaire **125**

Tables

Table 2.1 Employment of people with disabilities, by size and sector 20
Table 2.2 Number of employees with disabilities 23
Table 2.3 Share of disabled employees in total employment, by sector and size 25
Table 2.4 Reasons for not employing people with disabilities, random sample (weighted), variation, by size and sector 26
Table 2.5 Reasons for not employing people with disabilities, Symbol users 29
Table 2.6 Reasons for not employing people with disabilities subsequently, random sample (weighted) 29
Table 3.1 The existence of policies 33
Table 3.2 Size and the existence of policies 34
Table 3.3 Industry and the existence of policies, random sample (weighted) 35
Table 3.4 Industry and the existence of policies, Symbol users 35
Table 3.5 The coverage of written policies 36
Table 3.6 Actively attempting to attract disabled applicants, by size (number of employees) 38
Table 3.7 Actively attempting to attract disabled applicants, by sector 39
Table 3.8 Methods used to attract applications from people with disabilities 40
Table 3.9 Ease of attracting applications from disabled recruits 41

Table 3.10 Consultation 43

Table 3.11 The retention of existing employees who become disabled 44

Table 3.12 Steps prepared to take to retain an existing employee who became disabled in employment, random sample 45

Table 3.13 Steps prepared to take to retain an existing employee who became disabled in employment, Symbol users 45

Table 4.1 Employment opportunities for people with different types of disability 49

Table 4.2 Percentage of each size band reporting it not possible to employ people with each disability, random sample 50

Table 4.3 Percentage of each size band reporting all or some jobs available to people with each disability, random sample 51

Table 4.4 Barriers to the employment of specific disabilities, random sample 54

Table 4.5 Problems with the type of work 55

Table 5.1 Preparedness to accommodate disabled staff 58

Table 5.2 Preparedness to accommodate disabled staff, by establishment/organisation size 59

Table 5.3 Willingness to pay for adaptations/alterations necessary to employ a disabled person 61

Table 5.4 Willingness to pay for adaptations/alterations, by establishment/organisation size 62

Table 5.5 Estimates of preparedness to pay among respondents stating that sum would depend on person, job, or disability in question 63

Table 5.6 Overall estimates of willingness to pay for adaptations/ alterations 63

Table 5.7 Preparedness to pay more to retain an established employee 64

Table 5.8 Willingness to pay for adaptations or alterations necessary to retain an existing employee who becomes disabled 65

Table 5.9 Overall estimates of willingness to pay for adaptations/ alterations necessary to retain an existing employee who becomes disabled 66

Table 6.1 Awareness of/contact with main sources of information/ advice 69

Table 6.2 Awareness of main sources of information/advice, by establishment size, random sample 70

Table 6.3 Use of other sources of advice/information/assistance 72

Table 6.4 Awareness of/contact with DEAs/PACTs *etc.*, by size and sector, random sample 74

Table 6.5 Main reasons for employer contact with PACTs/DEAs *etc.* 75

Table 6.6 Perceived usefulness of employer contact with PACTs/ DEAs *etc.* 76

Table 6.7 Assistance/support received through Access to Work/ Special Schemes 77

Table 6.8 Employer participation in local/national bodies/ networks related to disability 78

Table 6.9 Employer participation in disability networks, by establishment/organisation size 79

Table 6.10 Membership of specific national/local bodies on disability issues 80

Table 6.11 perceived usefulness of employer membership of disability networks/bodies 81

Table 6.12 Reasons given for not joining employer-based network/ body on disability issues 81

Table 6.13 Perceived potential usefulness of local employer-led body on disability issues 82

Table 6.14 Perceived usefulness of local networks, by establishment size 82

Table 6.15 Why would local employer-led body on disability issues not be useful? 83

Table 6.16 What should a local employer network on disability do? 84

Table 7.1 Awareness and use of the Symbol 89

Table 7.2 Awareness of the Symbol and industrial sector, random sample 90

Table 7.3 Length of time signed up to Symbol use 91

Table 7.4 Reasons for not signing up to the Symbol, random sample 92

Table 7.5 Reasons for making the commitment 93

Table 7.6 Symbol use and the employment of people with disabilities and the existence of a policy, random sample 95

Table 7.7 Percentages reporting it not possible to offer employment to people with each type of disability, random sample 96

Table 7.8 Symbol use and consultation with disabled employees, random sample 96

Table 7.9 Methods of monitoring 97

Table 7.10 The usefulness and types of support received from PACTs/MODU, Symbol users sample only 98

Table 7.11 Where the Symbol is used 99

Table 7.12 Whether Symbol use makes a difference 100

Table 7.13 Whether Symbol use makes a difference, by size of organisation, Symbol users sample 100

Table 7.14 What difference has being a Symbol user made? 101

Table A.1.1. Target random sample characteristics 105

Table A.1.2 Achieved random sample characteristics, by size and sector 106

Table A.1.3 Other achieved sample characteristics, random (unweighted) and Symbol users 107

Table A.1.4 Achieved sample size and sector characteristics, Symbol users 108

Table A.1.5 Sample characteristics, weighted random sample, by size and sector 109

Table A.2.1. Characteristics of re-weighted sample from 1993 IES (IMS) survey, random sample only 111

Table A.2.2 Employment of people with disabilities, by organisation size 112

Table A.2.3 Employment of people with disabilities, by sector 112

Table A.2.4 Number of employees with disabilities 113

Table A.2.5 Reasons for not employing people with disabilities 113

Table A.2.6 Perceived problems/difficulties associated with employing people with disabilities, by organisation size 114

Table A.2.7 Perceived problems/difficulties associated with employing people with disabilities, by sector 114

Table A.2.8 Nature of perceived problems/difficulties associated with employing people with disabilities 115

Table A.2.9 Formal policies on recruitment/employment of people with disabilities, by organisation size 115

Table A.2.10 Formal policies on recruitment/employment of people with disabilities, by sector 116

Table A.2.11 Actively seeking to recruit people with disabilities, by organisation size 116

Table A.2.12 Actively seeking to recruit people with disabilities, by sector 117

Table A.2.13 How does organisation seek to recruit people with disabilities? 117

Table A.2.14 Experienced problems/difficulties in the employment of people with disabilities, by organisation size 118

Table A.2.15 Experienced problems/difficulties in the employment of people with disabilities, by sector 118

Table A.2.16 Existence of specific disabilities that would prevent a person being employed in the organisation, by organisation size 119

Table A.2.17 Existence of specific disabilities that would prevent a person being employed in the organisation, by sector 119

Table A.2.18 Specific disabilities seen as a barrier to employment 120

Table A.2.19 Specific actions taken to employ people with disabilities, by organisation size 120

Table A.2.20 Specific actions taken to employ people with disabilities, by sector 121

Table A.2.21 Extra costs associated with employing people with disabilities, by organisation size 121

Table A.2.22 Extra costs associated with employing people with disabilities, by sector 122

Table A.2.23 Maximum acceptable extra costs associated with employing disabled person 122

Table A.2.24 Whether prepared to spend more for existing employee becoming disabled, by organisation size 123

Table A.2.25 Whether prepared to spend more for existing employee becoming disabled, by sector 123

Table A.2.26 Whether sought help, support or advice regarding recruitment/employment of people with disabilities, by organisation size 124

Executive Summary

Introduction

This report sets out the main findings of a national survey of employers[1], examining the recruitment and retention of people with disabilities.

The aims of this study were:

- to improve understanding of employer policies and practices towards the employment of people with disabilities, building on and extending earlier research commissioned by the Employment Department
- to assess employer awareness of, use of and policies towards the Employment Service 'Disability Symbol', which sets a good practice standard for the employment of disabled people
- to investigate employer awareness and perceptions of Local Employer Networks on disability
- to examine employer contact with, use of and satisfaction with Placing Assessment and Counselling Teams (PACTs)
- to assess employer awareness and uptake of the Access to Work (AtW) programme.

In addition, and cutting across all these themes, the study paid particular attention to the views, behaviour and problems of small and medium sized employers (SMEs)[2] with regard to the employment of people with disabilities.

Methodology and approach

Interviews were conducted with two samples of employers:

---

[1] The research was commissioned jointly by the Employment Service and the Employment Department (now the Department for Education and Employment).

[2] No firm definition of what constitutes an SME was adopted. Rather, the analysis was undertaken with the data broken down into five size categories in order to examine the impact of employer size on the employment of people with disabilities.

- a representative sample of 1,250 employing establishments with more than ten employees (referred to as the random sample)
- a (predominantly) organisation-based sample of 250 registered users of the Employment Service's 'Disability Symbol' (referred to as the Symbol users sample).

Interviews were conducted by telephone, and the same questions were asked of each sample (with some minor variations to allow for the different sampling base — establishment or organisation). The interviews were conducted before the Disability Bill (now an Act) was introduced into Parliament. The findings take no account, therefore, of the new duties laid down in the Act.

The employment of people with disabilities

Eighty-five per cent of the Symbol users sample, and slightly over 40 per cent of the random sample were employing at least one disabled person. The majority were employing only a few disabled people. In both samples, over 90 per cent of those employers with any disabled employees employed five or fewer people with disabilities.

In both samples, there was a strong association between the number of employees in the establishment or organisation and the likelihood of any people with disabilities being employed. The size effect was particularly strong within the random sample. Only a third (32 per cent) of establishments with between eleven and 25 employees had any disabled employees, compared with just over 90 per cent of those with 200 or more employees. Within the Symbol users sample, 59 per cent of the smallest organisations employed people with disabilities, compared with 97 per cent of those with 200 employees or more. The weaker effect of size within the Symbol users sample was probably due to both the greater potential for organisations (compared with establishments) to offer opportunities for disabled people, and the fact of their all being registered as Symbol users.

There was no strong relationship between industrial sector and the employment of people with disabilities.

Reasons for not employing people with disabilities

The two most common reasons given by respondents for not having any disabled employees were:

- that no one with a disability had applied for a job at the establishment or organisation, and

- that a person with a disability had been employed but had subsequently left.

Respondents giving the latter reason were asked why they had not employed a disabled person subsequently. A third of these respondents in the random sample had not recruited anyone at all since the person left and two thirds had not received any applications from people with disabilities.

Very few respondents reported that disabled people had applied but not been recruited because of their disability. Where this had occurred, the barriers to employing these people were related to the nature of the work and/or equipment and health and safety reasons.

Policies towards the employment of people with disabilities

The existence and nature of policies

Forty-five per cent of organisations in the Symbol users sample had a policy specifically addressing the employment of people with disabilities (41 per cent were written policies and four per cent unwritten). Only 17 per cent of establishments in the random sample had such a policy (12 per cent were written and five per cent unwritten). It was common for the employment of people with disabilities to be addressed through general equal opportunities policies. Forty-seven per cent of Symbol users and 48 per cent of the random sample included policies towards the employment of people with disabilities in such general policies.

There was a direct relationship between the size of establishment/organisation and the existence of a written policy. The smallest employers were least likely to report the existence of such a policy. However, this may mean that small employers are less likely to adopt a formal approach to the employment of people with disabilities, rather than that they are less sympathetic towards them. The larger the organisation, the more likely it is to have the resources to devote to equal opportunity issues. The existence of a policy varied little by industrial sector.

Where a written policy existed, it typically covered a broad range of issues. Training and development and recruitment were most frequently included. Over three-quarters also covered: retention; consultation; promotion; monitoring; promoting awareness; and adaptations to working practices. The Symbol users sample reported a slightly higher coverage of each item.

Attracting applications from people with disabilities

Almost 71 per cent of Symbol users and eleven per cent of the random sample were actively trying to attract applications from people with disabilities.

Job applications welcoming disabled applicants and specific requests to the Jobcentre/Careers Office were the most commonly used methods of trying to attract applicants. Notifying the PACT team was mentioned by a fifth of the random sample and 40 per cent of Symbol users. Amongst the Symbol users sample, just over three-quarters identified the Symbol as a means of attracting disabled applicants.

Ease of attracting applications from people with disabilities

Almost 40 per cent of respondents in both samples reported that it was either difficult or very difficult to attract applications from disabled people. When asked why, the majority simply said that no disabled people applied for vacancies. A minority mentioned that applicants were not suited to the job or that the person's disability was a barrier to their recruitment.

Only eight per cent of the random sample reported that it was easy to attract applicants from people with disabilities, compared with 21 per cent of Symbol users. Symbol users most frequently explained this in terms of use of the Symbol and their proactive stance on disability issues. Respondents in the random sample, however, tended to explain it in terms of the type of work making it easy for them to employ disabled people.

Interviewing applicants

One of the commitments made by Symbol users is to interview all applicants with a disability who meet the minimum criteria for a job vacancy. However, there was no difference in the extent to which members of the two samples reported that they would try to do this: 96 per cent of each.

Consultation at work

Symbol users also make a commitment to consult disabled employees at least once a year. Around 74 per cent of Symbol users reported consulting employees, formally or informally. From the random sample (of those who had any disabled employees) just over 40 per cent did *not* consult these employees regularly, compared with over a quarter of Symbol users. Most consultation in both groups took place on an informal basis.

Retention of employees who become disabled

Virtually every respondent reported that they would be prepared to take positive steps to retain an existing employee in employment if they become disabled. A minority qualified their answer, saying it would depend on the job or disability.

Perceptions of, and attitudes towards people with disabilities

Perceptions of the 'employability' of people with different disabilities

People with difficulties in seeing, and mental handicaps/ learning difficulties, were reported to be the hardest to employ. Those with difficulties affecting mobility (found to be the most difficult to employ in earlier studies) came lower down the list in terms of perceived difficulty.

The disabilities seen as least likely to cause problems related to hearing, allergies and skin conditions; heart and circulation problems; epilepsy; and diabetes. In their milder forms, many of these were seen as causing no difficulties and were frequently not even noticeable.

Respondents in the random sample were more likely than were Symbol users to see people with any given type of disability as difficult to employ.

Why are people with some types of disability seen as difficult to employ?

The main perceived problem related to the nature of the work, and this was the case for all types of disability. Hardly any adverse comments were made about the productivity, propensity to take sick leave or personal characteristics of disabled people, nor about the attitudes of other employees towards disabled colleagues.

Respondents were often not very specific about what it was about the nature of the work which made it unsuitable for people with disabilities. However, being able to move around the shop floor, the necessity for physical strength, and safety implications were all mentioned. The importance of communication skills was also mentioned in relation to difficulties in hearing, depression/nervous and mental disorders and mental handicap and learning difficulties.

The second most frequently mentioned problem varied according to the type of disability being considered. In some cases it was safety implications and in others difficulties in adapting premises.

Making accommodation for disabled staff

Preparedness to accommodate disabled staff

Almost all Symbol users were prepared to make costless changes to working practices or minor changes to the working

environment, and 84 per cent reported a willingness to pay for any necessary adaptations or alterations. Willingness to make and pay for such accommodations was less widespread among respondents in the random sample. Nevertheless, over two-thirds of the latter reported being willing to pay for any necessary changes.

Extent of willingness to pay to accommodate disabled staff

A significant minority of respondents reporting a willingness to pay to accommodate disabled recruits, could or would not report how much they would be willing to pay. In both samples, the largest group of respondents said 'it depends': on the person, the disability, or the job in question. The largest category of respondents comprised those who were prepared to pay between £100 and £1,000, and there was some tendency for the amount they were prepared to pay to increase with establishment/organisational size. There was little evidence to suggest that employers in the Symbol users sample were prepared to pay significantly more than their counterparts in the random sample.

Willingness to pay for accommodation for existing employees

The majority of respondents were prepared to pay more to accommodate an existing employee who becomes disabled during the course of their employment, than for a recruit who was already disabled. Only a small minority felt that it would make no difference.

Employer use of information/advice sources on disability

Respondents were asked whether they were aware of and whether they had had any contact with a number of potential sources of information/advice: the various disability services provided through the Employment Service (PACTs, Disability Employment Advisers (DEAs), *etc.*); MODU (the Major Organisations Development Unit); Access to Work; Committees for the Employment of People with Disabilities; Local Employer Networks (LENs) on disability; the Employers' Forum on Disability; and TECs.

Respondents in the Symbol users sample showed a considerably higher level of awareness and use of each source than respondents in the random sample. Half the respondents in the random sample reported being aware of PACTs and DEAs (Disability Employment Advisers) and 23 per cent were aware of LENs. Almost 90 per cent of respondents in the Symbol users sample were aware of PACTs and DEAs, and half were aware of LENs.

Amongst the random sample, awareness of TECs was greater than awareness of any other source. Almost 90 per cent of respondents reported being aware of TECs. TECs were the only source discussed which was not disability-specific, and this greater awareness was likely to be through contact over issues other than disability.

A wide range of other sources of support and advice were mentioned, among which the voluntary sector, Jobcentres and local authorities were most frequently contacted.

Contact with PACTs, DEAs, *etc.*

Those respondents who were aware of or had had contact with PACTs/DEAs were more likely to employ some people with disabilities than those who had not. Not only did awareness of PACTs/DEAs increase strongly with establishment size, but the extent to which awareness was turned into direct contact was similarly related to size.

Employers contacted PACTs/DEAs for a wide range of reasons, and these generally corresponded to the range of activities of these bodies. Symbol users were considerably more likely to have contact with regard to special equipment and for information on benefits for disabled people. They were less likely than employers in general simply to have had contact through literature.

The majority found contact with PACTs/DEAs either fairly useful or very useful.

Employer use of Access to Work and Special Schemes

Access to Work was a new programme at the time of the survey and take-up was relatively rare among respondents' employees. Some respondents would, however, have been involved in its predecessor, Special Schemes. Only three per cent of the random sample had had contact with AtW and 27 per cent of Symbol users had had such contact. The main types of support received were: payment for alterations to premises or equipment; payment for special aids or equipment; and assistance with travel costs to/from work.

Participation in employer disability networks

Symbol users were more likely than respondents in the random sample to have contact with employer networks and, having had contact, more likely to join. This is consistent with findings elsewhere, that membership of such networks tends to be dominated by larger, 'good practice' employers.

Coverage of these networks is very low to date. Less than two per cent of the random sample and 15 per cent of Symbol users were participating in some kind of network. However, there is considerable potential for expansion. The 'conversion rate' from contact to membership is relatively high. Members were generally positive about their membership.

The main reason for not belonging to a network was the lack of any perceived need for the type of support one could provide. A question asking whether respondents would find a local employer network providing advice and support on the employment of people with disabilities useful suggested considerable potential interest. Although this interest was related to establishment size, the gap in the extent of interest between small and large employers was small.

Respondents interested in joining a local network were asked what they would expect one to do. Their views generally corresponded with what such networks currently do. The main demand was for an organisation to act as a general source of advice and information. Beyond this, the most frequently mentioned specific activity was for networks to act as a conduit for suitable disabled applicants for employment. This interest corresponds with the well-documented concern of employers that, even when they have pro-active policies on disability, they have difficulty in attracting applicants. However, many local networks have tended to avoid the 'employment agency' role.

Symbol users

The Symbol users sample was drawn from records of organisations registered as being signed up to the Symbol. Nevertheless, eleven per cent of respondents did not seem to be aware of its existence. Overall, 76 per cent of the Symbol users sample identified themselves as signed up to the Symbol, with a further four per cent claiming to be working towards it. There was very little difference by industrial sector or organisational size in the extent of awareness or use of the Symbol.

Only 22 per cent of respondents in the random sample had heard of the Symbol. Overall, three per cent of the random sample were reported to be signed up to the Symbol. There was a relationship between establishment size and awareness and use of the Symbol in the random sample. The smaller the establishment the less likely was the respondent to report being aware of or signed up to the Symbol. It was also establishments which were part of larger organisations which were more likely to have knowledge of, or be signed up to the Symbol.

Reasons for not being signed up to the Symbol

Almost a fifth of the random sample reported that they had no need for Symbol use or that the need had not arisen. Around 14 per cent reported that the decision was a head office issue, and 13 per cent that they did not have enough information.

Reasons for making the commitment

The most common reason for signing up to Symbol use was a commitment to equal opportunities in general or the employment of people with disabilities in particular. Slightly over a tenth of each sample also reported that they wanted to make a public statement about the employment of people with disabilities. A fifth of the Symbol users sample claimed already to meet the criteria, and that there was, therefore, no reason not to sign up.

Practices associated with Symbol use

Symbol-using establishments and organisations were only slightly more likely to have some disabled employees than those who were not signed up. Symbol users were also more likely to have a policy specifically addressing the employment of people with disabilities, and to be more positive about the possibilities of employing disabled people.

Symbol users were more likely than non-users to consult regularly with their disabled employees. Nevertheless, a significant minority did not seem to be doing so.

The Symbol was mainly used on recruitment literature but also on stationery and general literature about the company. The Symbol is supposed to be used only on literature relating to recruitment, training, and employment. It was rarely but occasionally reported to be put to inappropriate uses, for example, on product marketing material.

Does being a Symbol user make a difference?

Forty-four per cent of Symbol users felt that Symbol use had affected their practices, but over 40 per cent reported that being a Symbol user had not made any difference to the organisation. This is not totally unexpected. A number of employers had signed up to the Symbol because their practices already met the criteria. Amongst others, use of the Symbol was seen as attracting more disabled applicants and enhancing the image of the employer.

Difficulties experienced and changes desired

Only one Symbol user in the random sample and 15 (eight per cent) in the Symbol users sample reported any difficulties with

Symbol use. The most frequently mentioned problem (by seven respondents), was the difficulty of ensuring that the whole organisation followed the commitments ensuing from Symbol use.

A slightly greater proportion of respondents reported that they would like to see some changes made in the Symbol itself or the commitments associated with it. The majority of changes suggested related to publicity and awareness. A smaller number wanted changes in the use and monitoring of the Symbol, for example, more monitoring of users' practices by Government.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and objectives of the study

This report sets out the main findings of a national employer-based survey commissioned jointly by the Employment Service (ES) and the Employment Department (ED)[1], examining the recruitment and retention of people with disabilities. The study aimed both to update and to extend existing knowledge of employer policies, practices and perceptions in this important area, and to address a number of specific policy concerns within ES and ED relating to the employment of people with disabilities.

More specifically, the aims of the study were fivefold:

- to improve our understanding of employer policies and practices towards the employment of disabled people, and the factors underlying their formulation, building on and extending previous ED-commissioned research on this subject (in particular, Honey S, Meager N and Williams M, *Employers' Attitudes towards People with Disabilities*, IMS Report No. 245, 1993)
- to assess employer awareness of, use of and policies towards the Employment Service's 'Disability Symbol', which sets a good practice standard for the employment of people with disabilities
- to investigate employer awareness and perceptions of Local Employer Networks on disability, a small number of which have been set up in different parts of the country. These are employer-led organisations, aiming to improve practice through facilitating employer networking and providing services and disseminating information to employers on disability issues (Maginn and Meager, 1995).
- to examine employer contact with, use of and satisfaction with Placing Assessment and Counselling Teams (PACTs), which are the mechanism through which the Employment Service delivers specialist local advice and support services for people with disabilities

[1] Now the Department for Education and Employment.

- to assess employer awareness and uptake of the Access to Work (AtW) programme, which replaces the previous system of 'Special Schemes', and is the means through which the Employment Service provides a range of financial and specialist help for disabled people to obtain or remain in employment.

In addition to, and cutting across all of these themes, the study also had a particular emphasis on the views, behaviours and problems of small and medium-sized employers (SMEs) with regard to the employment of people with disabilities. Previous research (Honey, Meager and Williams, 1993) confirms that lack of knowledge and awareness of help, advice and support on disability issues is a particular barrier for SMEs, and indeed that small businesses are generally less likely than their larger counterparts both to employ people with disabilities, and to have positive attitudes and policies towards their employment.

The random sample was, therefore, drawn to include establishments with more than ten employees, to ensure coverage of some very small employers. There was no size information available to structure the Symbol users sample, but this did, nevertheless, yield eleven per cent of responses from organisations with fewer than 25 employees.

1.2 The programmes covered by this study

This study included an exploration of employer attitudes to and use of the AtW programme, the Disability Symbol, and PACTs, all of which were designed to promote the employment of people with disabilities. This section provides a brief background on each of these.

1.2.1 Access to Work

Access to Work (AtW) was introduced in June 1994. It brought together in a single programme a range of services available to people with disabilities and their employers: for example, the Personal Reader Service and Fares to Work. People with disabilities are eligible for assistance if they are registered as disabled, or if they could register but have chosen not to do so. Employers pay towards the cost of the support only if it brings more general benefits to the business: for example, covering the cost of equipment which non-disabled employees will also use.

AtW was designed to be flexible and meet the needs of individuals. The types of support provided through the programme include:

- communicators for people with hearing impairments
- support workers for those needing practical help at work or in getting to work

- provision of equipment, or adaptations to existing equipment, to suit an individual's needs
- alterations to premises or a working environment so that an employee with a disability can work there.

An applicant can currently receive help to the value of £21,000 over five years, although it is envisaged that most people will require much less than this. After five years, the entitlement begins again. The AtW programme is currently being reviewed.

1.2.2 The Disability Symbol

In 1990, the Employment Service launched the 'two-tick' Disability Symbol for use by employers who wanted to demonstrate their commitment to employing people with disabilities. In 1993, following a consultation process, a revised version was introduced. The design of the Symbol was changed to include the wording 'Positive about Disabled People' and five specific commitments were introduced. Employers using the Symbol are required to follow the following practices:

- to interview all applicants with a disability who meet the minimum criteria for a job vacancy and consider them on their abilities
- to ask disabled employees at least once a year what can be done to make sure they can develop and use their abilities
- to make every effort when employees become disabled to make sure they stay in employment
- to take action to ensure that key employees develop the awareness of disability needed to make the commitments work
- each year, to review these commitments and what has been achieved, plan ways to improve on them and let all employees know about progress and future plans.

Large, national companies (with more than 4,000 employees) are expected to discuss the commitments and their practices with MODU (the Major Organisations Development Unit). Smaller organisations have to have similar discussions with PACTs. If these bodies (both of which are part of the Employment Service) are satisfied that the organisation can meet the commitments, it is allowed to use the Symbol.

1.2.3 Placing Assessment and Counselling Teams (PACTs)

PACTs were established in 1992. They bring together in one organisation the work previously carried out by Disablement Resettlement Officers, the Disablement Advisory Service and the Employment Rehabilitation Service. PACTs are locally-based. They provide an employment and advisory service for employers and people with disabilities.

Many large companies operate policies at a national level and do not want to deal with a number of local offices. Thus MODU provides a similar advisory service to large employers at a national level.

1.3 Methodology

1.3.1 Survey approach

The research was undertaken through a telephone survey, conducted in October to November 1994[1]. The interviews were conducted before the Disability Bill (now an Act) was introduced into Parliament. The findings, therefore, take no account of the new duties laid down in the Act. A telephone methodology was chosen because a postal survey, whilst allowing considerable cost reduction and/or greater coverage, would have been limited in the extent of attitudinal information which could be obtained, and would have added little to the existing quantitative data on these issues gathered in the previous IES (IMS) postal survey conducted in 1993 (Honey, Meager and Williams, 1993). Interviews were, therefore, required to provide this extension to the existing evidence. Given the range of issues to be explored, and the size of the sample required for representativeness, it was also clear that face-to-face interviews on the scale required would be ruled out by cost considerations.

1.3.2 Sample design

Two employer sub-samples were used:

- an establishment-based sample of 1,250 (achieved interviews) drawn from the British Telecom 'Connections in Business' database. The sample was structured by establishment size and sector, and randomly drawn across Great Britain. Larger sampling fractions were drawn for the larger employer size groups to avoid problems with small cell sizes for these groups, but the data were subsequently re-weighted using establishment population data from the Census of Employment to provide national representativeness (details of the sampling and weighting procedures used are provided in Appendix 1).
- a (predominantly) organisation-based sample of 250 registered users of the Employment Service's 'Disability Symbol', drawn randomly from the Employment Service's own database of approximately 800 such users.

---

[1] Fieldwork for the survey was conducted by Public Attitude Surveys (PAS) Ltd, and the authors are grateful to our partners at PAS for the efficient and co-operative way in which the survey was run.

Given the different sampling basis of the two sub-samples (one establishment-based, the other predominantly organisation-based[1]; one representative, the other not), the findings for the two sub-samples are presented separately throughout the report. Given that Symbol users can be presumed to have more developed policies and practices towards the employment of disabled people than employers in general, as well as being larger than average, the Symbol users sample provides a 'good practice' control group for all of the research issues in the study, as well as the basis for detailed investigation of Symbol use itself.

1.3.3 Research instruments

The same questionnaire (after piloting on 30 employers) was administered to both sub-samples (with minor variations because of the different — establishment or organisation — base of the two sub-samples), although the full set of detailed questions about Symbol use was, in practice, relevant to only a small proportion of respondents from the random sample. (The survey questionnaire is included as Appendix 3 of the report.)

An average interview length of 25 minutes was aimed for, in order to keep the burden on responding employers to a minimum, and because experience suggests that interviews longer than half an hour exceed the limits of what most employers can be expected to provide for a telephone survey of this type. The achieved average interview length was close to this target[2], with considerable variation between individual respondents (Symbol users, in particular, gave longer than average interviews, and SMEs in general, rather shorter ones). This time constraint on the interviews did, however, pose severe limitations on the level of detail which could be obtained on some of the issues, given the variety and complexity of the topics covered in the survey.

The person interviewed varied between organisations: in larger organisations it was typically a manager in the personnel/human resources department (where such positions existed, it was the person responsible for equal opportunities, or the employment of disabled people or, failing that, someone with responsibility for recruitment policy). In many smaller organisations without such a division of labour, the most appropriate interviewee was often the managing director, owner/proprietor or general manager.

---

[1] An 'establishment' is a workplace or site, at one address which may be part of a large company or a single-site firm. An 'organisation', by contrast, may have multiple sites or workplaces.

[2] In practice, the average interview time was 23 minutes.

1.3.4 Re-analysis of previous IES (IMS) survey data

The previous IES (IMS) survey on the employment of people with disabilities, conducted in early 1993 (Honey, Meager and Williams, 1993) provides the potential for useful comparisons with the current survey, since it covered a number of the same general issues as well as some of the specific central themes of the present study (*eg* use of the Disability Symbol, contact with PACT teams, and needs for information and support).

The present study, therefore, includes some re-analysis of data from the previous survey, to provide the basis for assessment of change over time in some of these issues. During the period since early 1993, there has been considerable publicity and some controversial debate about the employment of people with disabilities, and it is possible that employer views and perceptions will have changed over this period. Caution must be exercised in making such comparisons, however, since although the two studies had important similarities (they covered common issues, and both included random and 'good practice' sub-samples), there are important methodological differences which may affect the potential for comparison. In particular, the previous study was based on a postal survey, and the main (random) sample was organisation- rather than establishment-based.

A number of factors may explain the differences between the findings of the two surveys. Disability has become a higher-profile issue in recent years, and a number of measures designed to increase the employment and employability of people with disabilities have been introduced or strengthened. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to expect changes between the two surveys to indicate real changes in the employment of people with disabilities, and employers' attitudes towards their employability. However, the different methodological approaches introduce a number of uncertainties to any comparisons. It might be argued that respondents are more willing to disclose information over the telephone which they would not be prepared to put into writing. Alternatively, data collected in a postal questionnaire may be more accurate. Respondents have time to think about their responses and collect data, which they cannot do during a telephone interview. Furthermore, it could be argued that a postal survey is less personal than talking to someone on the telephone and postal responses may, therefore, be more accurate. In both surveys, the quality and accuracy of the data collected are dependent, at least in part, on the respondents and their knowledge of the organisation or establishment about which they are answering questions. Chapter 7, for example, reports that not all respondents in the Symbol users sample reported their organisation to be a Symbol user, yet this sample was drawn from a list of known Symbol users. However, most inaccuracies are likely to result in *under* estimates of the variables in question,

due to a lack of relevant knowledge on the part of the respondent.

Because of the difficulties of obtaining population weights for an organisation-based sample, the previous IES (IMS) study used unweighted data in its analysis. In incorporating these data in the present report, however, we have attempted to re-weight them to the population[1] to improve their comparability with the current survey data. Appendix 2 discusses the re-weighting procedures adopted, and provides tabulations of re-weighted data for a relevant selection of the variables from the earlier survey.

1.4 Structure of the report

The report is organised as follows:

- Chapter 2 looks at whether employers have employees with disabilities, and if so how many they employ; and if not, explores the reasons given for not employing disabled people.
- In Chapter 3 we look at the extent to which employers have explicit policies on the employment of people with disabilities, the nature and coverage of those policies, and the associated practices (relating, for example, to recruitment, consultation, retention *etc.*).
- Chapter 4 explores in more detail employers' perceptions of and attitudes towards disability in employment, looking in particular at their perceptions of which kinds of disability would or would not hinder employment in their organisation/establishment, and the reasons given for these perceptions.
- Chapter 5 examines the extent to which employers are prepared to adjust the working environment or make changes in working practices to help accommodate the needs of disabled employees, and how far they are prepared to pay for such changes.
- Chapter 6 addresses the extent to which employers are aware of, and make use of the various sources of information, advice and support on disability issues (with a particular focus on PACTs, AtW and LENs), and assesses their perceptions of the value of these various sources.
- Chapter 7 considers in detail employers' awareness, use and perception of the Employment Service's 'Disability Symbol'.
- The report concludes with three Appendices: the first describes the sampling and weighting methodologies used, and sets out the main characteristics (by size, sector *etc.*) of

[1] Using weights based on data obtained from Dun and Bradstreet Ltd.

the achieved samples; the second presents some re-weighted tables from the previous IES (IMS) survey for comparison purposes, and the third contains the research instrument used for the telephone survey.

2. The Employment of People with Disabilities

2.1 Introduction

This chapter considers the characteristics of employers who employed people with disabilities, as well as looking at those who did not. Analysis is primarily conducted with reference to employer size and sector of operation. Where possible, comparisons are made with a previous IES (IMS) survey, carried out in 1993, which also looked at the employment of people with disabilities (Honey, Meager and Williams, 1993).

2.2 Employers employing people with disabilities

Respondents were asked whether they currently employed any people with a disability or long-term health problem, whether or not they were registered as disabled. Not surprisingly the Symbol users sample showed a much greater incidence of employees with disabilities. Indeed, 85 per cent of the Symbol users sample reported having at least one disabled person in employment. Of the random sample, approximately 40 per cent were found to employ at least one person with a disability[1]. Slightly over one in ten of the Symbol users reported having no people with disabilities in employment. It must be recognised that these figures will understate the true extent of employment of people with disabilities. Some employers do not monitor whether or not employees have a disability, and many characteristics of disability are not visible. Furthermore, employees with a disability may not be registered disabled and may not want it known that they are disabled. Therefore, it is likely that a proportion of any workforce has some disability which is totally unknown to the employer. The previous IES (IMS) survey (Honey, Meager and Williams, 1993) indicated the tendency among employers not to identify some of their employees as disabled, who would, in accordance with a strict definition, have been seen as such. It may, of course, be the case that this tendency has declined over the period between this and the previous study. Increased awareness of disability issues may have contributed to such a change, with a greater number of

[1] This can be compared with 25 per cent of respondents from the reanalysed 1993 survey who reported employing at least one person with a disability (Table A.2 in Appendix 2).

Table 2.1 Employment of people with disabilities, by size and sector

	Random sample (weighted)				Symbol users sample			
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total (N= 100%)	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total (N= 100%)
Sector								
Energy/Water supply	37.4	62.6	0.0	11	80.0	20.0	0.0	5
Metals/Minerals	59.4	40.6	0.0	23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Engineering	57.2	41.4	1.4	90	75.0	25.0	0.0	8
Other Manufacturing	49.4	49.9	0.7	98	91.4	8.6	0.0	35
Construction	48.2	51.1	0.7	67	80.0	20.0	0.0	5
Distribution/Hotels	38.1	57.7	4.1	353	81.8	18.2	0.0	11
Transport/ Communication	46.3	52.5	1.3	65	87.5	12.5	0.0	8
Financial and Business Services	29.5	64.6	5.9	176	83.3	16.7	0.0	12
Other Services	44.6	50.7	4.7	373	84.4	13.2	2.4	167
Number of employees								
1 to 24	–	–	–	–	59.3	40.7	0.0	27
11 to 24	32.0	64.0	4.0	701	–	–	–	–
25 to 49	46.1	52.4	1.4	299	61.5	34.6	3.8	26
50 to 99	56.1	37.5	6.4	140	84.6	11.5	3.8	26
100 to 199	70.5	25.0	4.4	68	78.6	21.4	0.0	28
200 plus	91.5	5.3	3.2	49	96.8	1.6	1.6	126
Size Unknown	–	–	–	–	83.3	16.7	0.0	18
All respondents	42.4	53.9	3.7	1,257	84.9	13.5	1.6	251

Source: IES Survey, 1994

employers monitoring their employment of people with disabilities. The different sampling and data collection methods adopted in the two surveys may also have played a role in explaining some of the differences noted.

2.2.1 Size and sector analysis

In this section the employment of those with a disability is considered in relation to the size and industrial sector of their employer. Table 2.1 shows the size and sector breakdown of those employing people with disabilities in both the random and Symbol users samples.

Looking firstly at the employment of people with disabilities by size, Table 2.1, a clear pattern emerges, one which is familiar[1]. Both among the Symbol users and random respondents, the incidence of the employment of people with disabilities increased with establishment and organisation size. This rise in incidence across size bands was much greater among the random sample. Unexpectedly, organisations which fell into the '100 to 199' size category in the Symbol users sub-sample, reported a lower incidence of employing people with disabilities than those in the '50 to 99' size band. Among Symbol users, over half those in the lowest size band, which included organisations with less than eleven employees, employed at least one person with a disability. Of the random respondents in the lowest size category, only one third had an employee with a disability[2]. Around nine tenths of establishments and organisations in the larger size categories, both from the random and Symbol users samples, reported employing people with disabilities. The number was marginally greater among Symbol users.

Of particular note, however, is the fact that the association between Symbol use and employment of disabled people was not simply a reflection of the larger average size of these organisations.

As far as analysis by industrial sector is concerned, the picture is less clear. Looking at the random sample, establishments employing people with a disability ranged from 30 per cent in financial and business services to nearly 60 per cent in metals

---

[1] A similar relationship between employer size and the incidence of the employment of people with disabilities emerged from the re-analyses of the previous IES survey: for example 83 per cent of organisations in size band '200 plus' reported having at least one disabled employee, while 43 per cent of employers did so in the '50 to 99' category (Table A.2.2 in Appendix 2).

[2] The re-analyses of the 1993 survey gave a corresponding figure of 24 per cent, with those organisations with less than ten employees reporting a figure of 16 per cent. Extreme care should, however, be exercised in making comparisons between the two surveys. Any comparisons should focus on general patterns rather than precise numerical values for any variables — although both surveys were representative, the previous IES survey was based on a sample of organisations, and the current survey on a sample of establishments. It is not, therefore, legitimate to conclude that the higher proportion of respondents (*establishments*) with disabled employees in the current survey represents a genuine growth in the proportion of *organisations* with disabled employees (by definition, many organisations have multiple establishments).

and mineral extraction[1]. Broadly speaking, establishments in the production sectors would appear to be more likely to employ people with disabilities, with the exception of those in energy/water supply. Turning our attention to the Symbol users, the proportion of organisations employing people with disabilities was greater in all industries, compared with the random sample.

To some extent one could attempt to explain the high numbers of establishments in the random sample, in metals/minerals, engineering and other manufacturing, who report employing people with disabilities, as being the result of a disproportionate number of larger than average establishments in these sectors. It was, however, the energy and water supply sector which had the highest proportion of establishments in the larger size categories[2] and which also reported the lowest number of employers employing a disabled person. Care should, however, be exercised in the interpretation of this finding, given the small number of observations in this sector.

Chi-square tests carried out[3] in order to assess whether there was any statistically significant difference in the distribution of establishments employing disabled people, compared with those not employing disabled people, showed that there was, with at least 95 per cent confidence, by both size and sector. The degree of confidence in such a difference was greater when considering the distribution by size. In simple terms, these tests imply that the size and sectoral patterns observed are extremely unlikely to have occurred by chance and are, therefore, 'statistically significant'.

---

1 The previous IES (IMS) survey (1993) when reanalysed, gave a slightly different picture by individual SIC. However, the overall result was similar, with manufacturing employers being more likely to have an employee with a disability; 43 per cent of those employers in the metals/minerals sector had a disabled employee as did approximately 30 per cent in engineering and other manufacturing. The major significant difference between the findings came in construction, where, in the 1993 survey only 16 per cent reported having disabled employees. The financial and business services sector also had a relatively small number of respondents employing people with disabilities (see Table A.2.3 in Appendix 2).

2 See Table A.1.1 in Appendix 1 of this report.

3 Chi-square tests were conducted on the distribution of establishments employing at least one disabled person by size and sector, comparison being made with the distribution of all establishments by the same categories.

Table 2.2 Number of employees with disabilities

	Percentage of employers with given number of employees with disabilities			
	Random (Weighted)		Symbol users	
No. of employees with disabilities	Employees with disabilities	Registered disabled	Employees with disabilities	Registered disabled
2 or fewer	72.6	90.4	26.9	41.1
3 to 5	19.8	6.0	22.2	20.9
6 to 10	4.4	1.9	19.2	16.6
11 to 29	2.2	1.1	18.6	10.4
30 to 49	0.5	0.2	4.8	4.9
50 to 99	0.2	0.2	4.2	3.1
100 and over	0.3	0.2	4.2	3.1
No. of respondents who knew how many disabled people were employed (=100%)	503	450	167	163

Source: IES Survey 1994

2.2.2 The number of employees with disabilities

Respondents from both sub-samples were asked how many disabled and registered disabled employees they employed. Substantial numbers of respondents from both sub-samples, although employing people with disabilities and those registered disabled, were not able to give the number. Approximately 20 per cent of Symbol users who employed people with disabilities did not know how many they employed and 24 per cent did not know how many of their employees were registered disabled.

Table 2.2 looks at the number of employees with disabilities reported to be employed in our samples. Nearly 75 per cent of those establishments in the random sample employing at least one person with a disability actually employed two or fewer. The corresponding figure for the Symbol users sample was substantially lower at slightly over one quarter. However, 18.6 per cent of Symbol users employed 'eleven to 29' disabled people. This compares favourably with the 2.2 per cent in the same category for the random sample.

The distribution of establishments and organisations by number of people with disabilities employed varied considerably across the two samples, a finding one would expect. Symbol users were not only more likely to employ disabled people, but also more likely to employ larger numbers of people with disabilities.

Focusing attention on registered disabled employees, broadly similar differences between the two sub-samples emerged. As far as Symbol users were concerned, the number of organisations employing 'two or fewer' registered disabled

employees was nearly 15 per cent greater than those employing 'two or fewer' disabled employees. The corresponding figure among the random weighted sample was 90 per cent, 17 per cent greater than the number of establishments in the random sample employing 'two or fewer' people with disabilities. Generally, establishments employed fewer registered disabled people than those who were disabled but not registered.

It is, of course, not clear how much of the observed variation in the numbers of disabled employees between respondents simply reflected variations in organisation/establishment size. Table 2.3, therefore, controls for this by looking at the proportion of total employment among respondents which was accounted for by disabled employees.

Looking first at the total employment figures in Table 2.3, yields the initially surprising result that the share of total employment accounted for by people with disabilities was higher (at 2.2 per cent) in the random sample than in the Symbol users sample. Extreme care needs to be exercised in interpreting this finding, however, as the size and sector breakdown in the table reveals. It needs to be remembered that the Symbol users sample was very far from being a representative cross-section of organisations — it was dominated by large organisations, especially in the public sector. Of the 185 Symbol-using respondents in the table, nearly half were in the 200-plus size category, with an average workforce size of over 5,000. These large organisations dominate the Symbol users sample to the extent of accounting between them for nearly 99 per cent of total employment in the Symbol users sample. The table shows, further, that among the Symbol users, the proportion of the workforce with disabilities decreased strongly with organisation size. This is partly because small organisations which are also Symbol users are, virtually by definition, very atypical of small organisations in general, and much more likely than the latter (see also Table 2.1) to have at least one disabled employee. It is partly also because of a simple arithmetical effect — thus an organisation of ten employees, if it has any disabled employees (which as a Symbol user, it is more likely to), must have at least ten per cent of its workforce with disabilities *etc*. The more valid comparison, therefore, between the Symbol users and the random samples[1] focuses on individual size groups. The size breakdown in Table 2.3 conforms much more clearly to prior expectation, showing that for each size group (except the 200-plus category) Symbol users have a larger proportion (often considerably larger) of employees with disabilities in their workforces than do establishments in the random sample.

[1] Bearing in mind all the time, of course, that the former is a largely organisation-based sample, and the latter an establishment-based sample.

Table 2.3 Share of disabled employees in total employment, by size and sector

	Total employment	Disabled employees*	% of workforce disabled	Total (N =100%)	Total employment	Disabled employees*	% of workforce disabled	Total (N =100%)
Sector								
Energy/water supply	999	20	2.0	10	4,665	99	2.1	2
Metals/minerals	2,515	55	2.2	23	–	–	–	–
Engineering	5,225	120	2.3	87	586	33	5.6	7
Other manufacturing	6,116	181	3.0	95	9,664	248	2.6	26
Construction	2,225	63	2.8	63	623	28	4.5	5
Distribution/hotels	12,089	303	2.5	332	90,458	13	0.0	7
Transport/communication	5,132	81	1.6	63	2,780	62	2.2	7
Financial & business services	18,496	329	1.8	161	70,423	1,045	1.5	7
Other services	24,747	647	2.7	345	273,830	2,596	0.9	124
Size								
1 to 24	–	–	–	–	296	29	9.8	26
11 to 24	11,276	345	3.1	665	–	–	–	–
25 to 49	9,918	250	2.5	290	774	51	6.6	24
50 to 99	8,844	184	2.1	125	1,674	111	6.6	24
100 to 199	8,491	171	2.0	62	3,562	105	2.9	25
200 plus	39,016	784	2.0	38	446,723	3,828	0.9	86
No. of respondents (=100%)	77,545	1,735	2.2	1,180	453,029	4,124	0.9	185

** Includes registered and non-registered disabled employees*

Note: The table is based on respondents indicating both total employment and number of disabled employees.

Source: IES Survey, 1994

The reverse pattern observed in the 200-plus category (a higher proportion of disabled employees in the random sample) is likely to be mainly due to the 'width' of this size category — the '200-plus' organisations in the Symbol users sample are much larger than their counterpart establishments in the random sample (an average size of over 5,000 in the former, and just over 1,000 in the latter).

Turning to the sectoral analysis, small cell sizes in most sectors of the Symbol users sample limit the conclusions that can be drawn, but much of the variation between sectors was in fact a size effect — thus the lowest proportions of disabled employees were found in distribution and hotels, and other services. Symbol users in the former were predominantly large retail chains (average employment size in this sector is nearly 13,000) and large public sector employers in the latter (average employment size 2,200). It is notable in the random sample (where the average size variation between sectors was much smaller), that the sectoral variation in the proportion of the workforce with disabilities was rather small (varying between 1.6 per cent in transport and communications, and 3.0 per cent in other manufacturing).

These findings of sectoral variation are broadly consistent with Labour Force Survey (LFS) data on the sectoral incidence of people with disabilities in employment (although LFS estimates show a higher incidence, being based as they are on individual self-reporting, and using a wider definition of disability from that adopted here). Thus, the Winter 1994 LFS shows that the proportion of the workforce reporting a disability or long-term health difficulty which affects the kind of work they can do is five per cent overall, and varies between four and six per cent in individual sectors. Unfortunately, the establishment size data used in the LFS are not sufficiently detailed for comparison with the survey results presented here.

2.3 Employers not employing people with disabilities

The remainder of the chapter considers those organisations and establishments who reported that they did not employ anyone with a disability[1]. It also explores why this was the case and looks at the barriers to the employment of people with disabilities. Of the random sample, 678 establishments (54 per cent) reported not having a single disabled employee[2]. The corresponding figure for Symbol users was 13 per cent.

---

[1] Some of these establishments/organisations may have had disabled employees the respondent did not know about.

[2] The corresponding figures from the reanalysed 1993 survey were 647 employers or 73 per cent of the sample.

Table 2.4 Reasons for not employing people with disabilities, random sample (weighted), variation, by size and sector

	Percentage of respondents in sector and size band giving response						
	A	B	C	D	E	Don't know	Total (N=100%)
Sector							
Energy/water supply	92.8	0.0	0.0	7.2	0.0	0.0	7
Metals/minerals	27.6	7.0	0.0	50.4	2.0	0.0	10
Engineering	84.1	1.3	0.0	17.1	0.0	0.0	37
Other manufacturing	76.9	7.8	1.4	26.7	0.0	0.0	49
Construction	87.1	0.0	7.8	8.5	8.8	0.0	34
Distribution/hotels	88.2	4.6	2.1	10.3	2.9	0.1	204
Transport/communication	80.0	0.0	1.6	27.4	5.9	3.4	34
Financial and business services	73.0	5.6	0.0	13.1	5.3	5.9	114
Other services	83.4	9.2	1.3	12.0	1.1	0.1	189
Size							
11 to 24	84.1	3.5	1.2	14.0	2.8	1.0	449
25 to 49	81.6	9.4	1.4	11.7	3.8	2.0	157
50 to 99	71.4	10.5	1.9	20.7	3.8	0.0	53
100 to 199	62.0	12.8	9.2	16.1	0.0	3.3	17
200 plus	85.9	0.0	14.7	29.0	0.0	7.0	3
No. of respondents (=100%)	82.0	5.6	1.6	14.1	3.0	1.2	678

Key:

A No one with disabilities has applied.
B Some have applied but were not recruited on grounds other than disability.
C Some have applied but have not been recruited because of their disability.
D Some have been employed but have subsequently left the job.
E Other response given.

Source: IES Survey, 1994

2.3.1 Reasons for not employing people with a disability

Respondents from both samples were asked to give reasons why, at the time of the survey, they did not employ anyone with a disability.

Looking firstly at the random sample, Table 2.4 gives a size and sector breakdown of the reasons given for not employing people with disabilities. The two most common reasons cited were firstly, that no one with a disability had applied for a job at the establishment concerned (response A) and secondly, that a person with a disability had been employed but had

subsequently left (response D)[1]. Only 1.6 per cent of respondents who did not employ a disabled person, said that an applicant's disability had been a barrier to their employment[2].

Considering the sectoral breakdown of responses, over 70 per cent of establishments in all industrial sectors except for metals and minerals, referred to response A as the major reason for not having any disabled employees. For those establishments in this sector, results indicated that there had been an outflow of disabled employees. Nearly half the establishments without disabled employees in this sector reported having at one time employed a disabled person. It is likely that this reflects the combination of several factors: — thus, for example, many industries in this sector are declining in employment terms; and many (*eg* steel manufacturing, mining) are heavy industries, which may have a higher than average incidence of work-related disabilities and health problems.

A similar, but less marked tendency, could also be seen in other manufacturing, and transport and communications, where approximately one quarter of establishments reported having at least one employee with a disability who had left their employment.

As far as analysis by size is concerned, at least 60 per cent of establishments with no disabled employees, across all size bands, reported having failed to attract disabled applicants. No discernible pattern by size emerges among these respondents.

Employers who had employed a disabled person who had then left, represented over 16 per cent of establishments in size band '100 to 199', over one in five of those in size band '50 to 99' and nearly 30 per cent of establishments in size band '200-plus'.

Turning to Symbol users with no disabled employees, their reasons for not having disabled employees are reported in Table 2.5. Compared to the random sample they appeared to have less experience of not attracting disabled applicants for vacant posts, although the number of respondents on which Table 2.5 is based is very small. Over 17 per cent of organisations reported having not employed a disabled person on grounds other than their disability. This was three times the proportion from the random sample who cited such a reason. Over a quarter of Symbol users, who had no disabled employees, had previously employed a

---

[1] The 1993 survey provided very similar findings. Thus, of those not employing people with disabilities in the re-analyses of the 1993 survey, 86 per cent reported having no disabled applicants for vacancies, with 12 per cent having employed a disabled person who had subsequently left (Table A.2.5., Appendix 2).

[2] The corresponding figure for the reanalysed 1993 survey stood at 2.4 per cent.

Table 2.5 Reasons for not employing people with disabilities, Symbol users

Response	%
No one with disabilities has applied	64.7
Some have applied but were not recruited on grounds other than disability	17.6
Some have applied but have not been recruited because of their disability	5.9
Some have been employed but have subsequently left the job	26.5
Other response given	0.0
Don't know	2.9
No. of respondents (=100%)	34

Source: IES Survey, 1994

person with a disability. This was again higher than the figure reported among the random sample.

Those establishments and organisations who reported having employed a person in the past with a disability, who later left, were asked to specify why they had not subsequently recruited another such person. Among Symbol users 22 per cent had had no vacancies over the period in question and 45 per cent, although advertising vacancies, had had no disabled applicants.

As far as the random sample is concerned, Table 2.6 reports their responses to the question. One third of the relevant establishments reported no recruitment since the person in question had left their employment. Over 60 per cent had no disabled people applying for advertised vacancies. Only a very small proportion of the relevant random sample, 3.3 per cent, reported having rejected an applicant on the grounds that she or he had been disabled.

Table 2.6 Reasons for not employing people with disabilities subsequently, random sample (weighted)

Response	%
No recruitment since person left	32.5
No one has applied	64.5
Disability presents too many problems	1.2
None recruited on grounds other than disability	2.9
None recruited on ground of disability	3.3
No reason given	0.5
Other response given	0.0
Don't know	0.0
No. of respondents (N=100%)	95

Source: IES Survey, 1994

2.3.2 Barriers to the employment of people with disabilities

All respondents who had no disabled employees and had not subsequently, or ever, recruited a disabled person on the grounds of their disability, were asked what specifically about the disability prevented the person's employment.

Among Symbol users this question applied to only two respondents, one of which had not employed a person with a disability for safety reasons and the other because of the nature of the work involved.

Turning to the random sample, the questions concerning barriers to employment of people with disabilities were relevant to a similarly small proportion of the sample: two per cent of those not employing people with disabilities. The nature of the work involved, safety reasons, and unsuitable equipment were the most common barriers to employment[1].

2.4 Summary

A number of conclusions can be drawn from this discussion:

- A clear relationship exists between the employment of people with disabilities and employer size. This was also the case in 1993.
- The relationship between industry and the employment of people with disabilities is unclear — as was the case in the earlier 1993 survey, many of the observed differences are likely to be the result of an uneven size distribution of employers across sectors.
- The proportion of employers employing a disabled person appears to have risen over the period between the two surveys. This is as likely to represent the different sampling approaches adopted in the two surveys, however, as it is to be a 'real' rise, reflecting the consequence of heightened awareness, resulting from the high profile enjoyed by issues of disability and employment in the intervening period.
- Symbol users were more likely than other organisations to employ people with disabilities; this holds true in all size groups, and was not, therefore, simply a reflection of the fact that Symbol users were on average larger organisations.

---

[1] The 1993 survey asked those not employing people with disabilities if they experienced any problems in employing them: 66 per cent of the reanalysed survey said they did. The most common difficulties alluded to included the type of work required of employees and difficulties in relation to the required modification of premises.

- Symbol users were more likely to employ larger numbers of people with disabilities, both registered and non-registered disabled.
- People with disabilities made up two per cent of employment in the random sample (the figure was lower in the Symbol users sample, but this reflected the non-random nature of the latter, especially its dominance by very large organisations). The proportion of the workforce with disabilities tended to decrease with establishment (and organisation size), and this size effect was more notable than any sectoral variation.
- Those not employing people with disabilities continued to experience difficulties in attracting disabled applicants — this tendency was less prevalent among Symbol users, however.

3. Policies Towards the Employment of People with Disabilities

This chapter explores the extent to which employers had policies on the recruitment and employment of people with disabilities, and the nature of these policies.

3.1 The existence of policies

Respondents were asked whether there was a policy on the employment of people with disabilities covering the establishment (random sample) or organisation (Symbol users). They were further prompted to check whether this was a written or unwritten policy and, if no policy was reported, whether a general equal opportunities policy existed which specifically addressed the employment of people with disabilities.

Those in the Symbol users sample were considerably more likely to report the existence of a written policy specifically addressing the employment of people with disabilities (41 per cent compared to 11.7 per cent of the random sample[1]). This is not surprising as Symbol users have made a commitment to the employment of people with disabilities. However, it appears that it is more common for the employment of this group to be addressed through general equal opportunities policies. Nearly half the respondents in each sample reported the existence of such a policy (Table 3.1). This pattern matches the findings reported in the earlier study:

> *'Most case study organisations saw disability as an equal opportunities issue and as such, policies on the employment of people with disabilities tended to be integrated into more general equal opportunity policies'* (Honey, Meager and Williams, 1993).

[1] See Table A2.9 for the incidence of policies in previous survey. This question did not include a category for general equal opportunities. It appears that the balance between written and unwritten policies has changed. The different nature of the samples must, however, be borne in mind.

Table 3.1 The existence of policies

	% reporting each type of policy	
	Random (weighted)	Symbol users
Written policy	11.7	41.0
Unwritten policy	5.2	4.4
General equal opportunities policy	48.0	47.4
No policy specifically aimed at people with disabilities	33.2	6.4
Don't know	2.0	0.8
No. of respondents (=100%)	1,257	251

Source: IES survey, 1994

3.1.1 Policies and size

The existence of a policy varied by type of establishment/organisation but it was size (number of employees) rather than industrial sector which seemed to exert the most influence. This also emerged in other parts of the analysis. Table 3.2 shows that as the size of the organisation or establishment increased, the proportion of respondents reporting 'no policy' declined. In both samples there was a considerable drop in this proportion once the size of the establishment/organisation passed 50 employees. A further large drop occurred between the '100 to 199', and '200 or more' employees bands.

The proportion with unwritten policies varied little by size in the random sample, and showed no particular pattern amongst Symbol users. The proportion reporting a general equal opportunities policy increased very slightly with size in the random sample. Amongst Symbol users it varied around the average but in no particular pattern.

The key point of this analysis is that the main influence of size was the lower propensity of small establishments or organisations to have any form of policy addressing the employment of people with disabilities. This does not necessarily mean that small employers were less likely to be sympathetic towards the employment of people with disabilities, but that they were less likely to approach such employment through formal policies and practices. The evidence presented in Chapter 2 above confirmed that small employers were less likely than their larger counterparts to have employees with disabilities. Causality is, however, difficult to interpret here — are they less likely to recruit and employ disabled people *because* they have no clearly formulated policy on this issue, or is it the case that because they rarely encounter disabled job applicants or employees they do not feel the need to develop such policies?

Table 3.2 Size and the existence of policies

	Written	Unwritten	Equal opportunities	None	Don't know	Total (N =100%)
	Random sample (weighted)					
	% reporting each type of policy					
11 to 24	9.1	4.5	46.1	38.4	1.9	701
25 to 49	11.9	6.0	45.7	34.2	2.3	299
50 to 99	16.9	5.9	55.7	19.1	2.5	140
100 to 199	15.5	6.5	59.0	17.5	1.6	68
200+	28.1	6.1	51.4	13.2	1.1	49
All respondents	11.7	5.2	48.0	33.2	2.0	1,257
	Symbol users sample					
1 to 24	29.6	11.1	44.4	14.8	–	27
25 to 49	19.2	7.7	50.0	23.1	–	26
50 to 99	57.7	–	34.6	3.8	3.8	26
100 to 199	32.1	10.7	53.6	3.6	–	28
200+	46.0	1.6	50.0	2.4	–	126
All respondents[1]	40.8	4.3	48.1	6.4	0.4	233

Source: IES survey, 1994

This size analysis can be taken further with the random sample. Respondents were also asked whether the establishment was part of a larger organisation or the only site and, if part of an organisation, the number of employees in the UK. Forty four per cent of the single site organisations did not have any policy addressing the employment of people with disabilities, compared with only 24 per cent of those establishments belonging to a larger organisation. Organisational size played some role in this. The single site organisations were predominantly small (66 per cent had eleven to 24 employees, and only four per cent had 100 or more). It is likely that the larger organisations with more sites will have had an identifiable personnel function with greater resources to devote to equal opportunities issues.

3.1.2 Policies and industrial sector

The existence of some sort of policy addressing the employment of people with disabilities varied relatively little by industrial sector (Table 3.3). Amongst the random sample, respondents in the energy, metals/minerals and transport sectors were most

[1] Eighteen respondents did not know the number of employees in the organisation the total figures, therefore, vary slightly from those given in Table 3.1.

Table 3.3 Industry and the existence of policies, random sample (weighted) (per cent)

	Written	Unwritten	Equal opportunities	None	Don't know	Total (N =100%)
Energy/water supply	9.7	3.4	24.3	58.1	4.5	11
Metals/minerals	4.7	3.7	48.5	43.2	–	23
Engineering	5.4	5.7	52.9	32.4	3.6	90
Other manufacturing	4.8	17.4	46.3	31.3	0.2	98
Construction	9.5	8.9	51.7	29.9	–	67
Distribution/hotels	10.0	2.4	48.4	34.8	4.5	353
Transport/communications	3.1	9.7	44.1	43.2	–	65
Financial and business services	16.9	1.3	49.9	31.9	–	176
Other services	16.7	5.0	46.6	30.3	1.4	373

Source: IES survey, 1994

likely not to have any policy (58.1 per cent, 43.2 per cent and 43.2 per cent of each). Amongst the other sectors, the type of policy varied slightly. Fairly similar proportions reported the existence of general equal opportunity policies. Establishments in the financial and business services and other services sectors were most likely to have written policies (16.9 per cent and 16.7 per cent respectively).

Amongst Symbol users the patterns were more varied (Table 3.4). Manufacturing organisations were least likely to have any sort of policy (12 to 14 per cent). There were also large differences in the balance between general equal opportunities policies and written policies specifically addressing people with disabilities. However, the number of cases in some sectors is rather small and these patterns need to be treated with care.

Table 3.4 Industry and the existence of policies, Symbol users (per cent)

	Written	Unwritten	Equal opportunities	None	Don't know	Total (N = 100%)
Energy/water supply	20.0	–	60.0	–	20.0	5
Metals/minerals	–	–	–	–	–	–
Engineering	37.5	25.0	25.0	12.5	–	8
Other manufacturing	25.7	8.6	51.4	14.3	–	35
Construction	40.0	20.0	40.0	–	–	5
Distribution/hotels	63.6	9.1	18.2	9.1	–	11
Transport/communications	25.0	–	75.0	–	–	8
Financial and business services	25.0	–	66.7	8.3	–	12
Other services	45.5	2.4	46.7	4.8	0.6	167

Source: IES survey, 1994

Table 3.5 The coverage of written policies

	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users %
Recruitment	89.7	97.1
Training and development	82.3	91.3
Promotion	74.8	81.6
Monitoring number of people with disabilities	70.1	81.6
Consulting with disabled employees on their needs	70.1	78.6
Encouraging the retention of employees who are disabled	66.0	79.6
Promoting awareness amongst employees generally	66.0	75.7
Monitoring policies towards people with disabilities	66.0	68.0
Adapting working hours and patterns as necessary	61.9	65.0
No. of respondents (=100%)	147	103

Source: IES survey, 1994

3.2 The coverage of policies

Where a written policy existed, respondents were asked what the policy covered. A list of possible items was developed based on past experience and piloting. This was read out (see Table 3.5) and respondents identified each item that was covered by their policy. A prompt of 'anything else' identified very few additional items.

If a policy existed, it tended to be broad in coverage. All the items mentioned were included in at least 60 per cent of the written policies. Recruitment, and training and development were most frequently included. The Symbol users sample had slightly higher coverage of most items. This was not unexpected. Symbol users make a commitment to the employment of people with disabilities and some of the items included in our list are identified as specific commitments they should be meeting. In particular, recruitment, consultation, retention and promoting awareness are identified. The non-inclusion of each in a policy does not necessarily mean that an organisation was reneging on its commitments. Members of the Symbol users sample were generally much more likely to include such items in their policy than those in the random sample. However, amongst what could be considered 'good practice' organisations, it might be expected that all these issues would be covered in any written policies.

3.3 Some additional practices

Having a policy is not necessarily enough to ensure that 'good practice' is put into action, or that people with disabilities are given the opportunity to obtain or retain jobs. We therefore asked some additional questions about the specific actions taken by both samples. Some of these related to specific commitments

made by Symbol users, others were more general. The information was sought of the whole sample as it was important to compare the actions of different groups of employer. The Symbol users sample generally appeared in a more positive light, but significant proportions of the random sample were also acting in some areas.

This section explores the responses to four questions or groups of questions:

- *'When filling job vacancies, do you actively try to attract applications from people with disabilities?'* The activities of those actively looking for applications were then further explored.
- *'Assuming the minimum criteria for doing a job are met, would you try to interview most or all applicants with a disability who applied?'*
- *'Do you consult disabled employees on a regular basis about their needs at work?'* Further details on the methods of consultation were also collected.
- *'If an existing employee became disabled, would you be prepared to take positive steps to retain them in employment?'* Information was then collected on the steps employers would be prepared to take.

3.3.1 Attracting applications from people with disabilities

One of the strongest differences between the two samples emerged when attempts to attract applications from people with disabilities were explored. Chapter 2 reported that the main reason for not employing people with disabilities was a lack of applications from this group. Although the reasons for this are likely to be varied and complex, the attempts made by employers to attract applications, or at least appear sympathetic to people with disabilities, probably plays an important role.

Almost 71 per cent of Symbol users and eleven per cent of the random sample were actively trying to attract applications from people with disabilities[1]. This is not unexpected and reflects the commitment of Symbol users to provide opportunities for people with disabilities. On this measure, members of the random sample appear in a less favourable light although, as will be seen below, this is not always the case.

This active seeking of applications was fairly strongly related to establishment size in the random sample, as can be seen in Table 3.6. Slightly over eight per cent of establishments with between

[1] It appears that there has been a growth in the proportion of employers actively trying to attract applications from people with disabilities in recent years. See Table A2.12 in Appendix 2 for the findings from the previous survey.

Table 3.6 Actively attempting to attract disabled applicants, by size (number of employees)

	% actively attempting to attract disabled applicants			
	Random sample (weighted)		Symbol users	
	%	N	%	N
1 to 24 (Symbol)	–	–	63.0	27
11 to 24 (random)	8.4	701	–	–
25 to 49	7.4	299	30.8	26
50 to 99	17.9	140	73.1	26
100 to 199	18.5	68	82.1	28
200 plus	32.9	49	77.8	126
All respondents	10.7	1,257	70.8	233

Source: IES survey, 1994

eleven and 24 employees were actively seeking disabled recruits and this rose to almost a third of those with 200 or more employees. As was the case when we considered the existence of policies, employment levels of 50 and 200 employees appeared to be 'thresholds', above which there was a notable increase in the proportion of employers exhibiting the behaviour in question.

Once again, the relationship with organisational size amongst Symbol users was less clear cut (Table 3.6). Although size is a variable which usually shows strong patterns in studies of employers, the lack of a clear direction is not necessarily a surprise amongst this group. It is known that larger companies are most likely to employ people with disabilities. As this sample was made up entirely of companies who had made a commitment to the employment of people with disabilities, it is not unreasonable to expect that the behaviour of larger and smaller companies will be more similar than might normally be expected. The extent of difference is perhaps more surprising than the lack of it.

The differences between industrial sectors were less prominent (Table 3.7)[1]. It is perhaps interesting to note that in two of the sectors least likely to have a policy, energy and metals/minerals, relatively high proportions of establishments were actively trying to attract applications from people with disabilities. (Care needs to be exercised in interpreting these data due to small cell sizes in these sectors, but they do at least suggest the possibility that lack of a formal policy on disabilities does not always imply the lack of a proactive stance on recruiting disabled people). Symbol users show a more varied pattern but again the numbers in some sectors are small, and these have to be treated with care.

[1] See also Table A2.13 in Appendix 2.

Table 3.7 Actively attempting to attract disabled applicants, by sector

	% actively attempting to attract disabled applicants			
	Random sample (weighted)		Symbol users	
	%	N	%	N
Energy/water supply	22.3	11	80.0	5
Metals/minerals	24.1	23	–	–
Engineering	6.8	90	50.0	8
Other manufacturing	7.1	98	62.9	35
Construction	4.9	67	20.0	5
Distribution/hotels	7.3	353	63.6	11
Transport/communications	3.4	65	25.0	8
Financial and business services	17.9	176	66.7	12
Other services	13.5	373	77.8	167
All respondents	10.7	1,257	70.9	251

Source: IES survey, 1994

Those who actively sought applications from people with disabilities were asked how they tried to do this. A prepared list was read out, and respondents were prompted to see if anything had been missed. Table 3.8 lists the responses[1]. Some strong differences emerged between the actions of the two samples.

With the exception of 'specific request to Jobcentre/Careers Office' and 'advertising without discrimination', all the methods listed were used by a higher proportion of the Symbol users sample than of the random sample. This suggests that individual members of this sample were using a wider range of methods than members of the random sample. Some of this can probably be explained by the different nature of the two samples. However, it may also be related to the greater awareness of Symbol users of the available sources of help and their being more prepared to use them. (See the discussion on this in Chapter 6.)

'Use of the Disability Symbol/logo' was used as a means of attracting applicants by 76.4 per cent of the Symbol users sample and 19 per cent of the random sample. Some of the random sample were Symbol users as will be discussed later (Chapter 7). It is perhaps interesting that nearly a quarter of Symbol users who were actively seeking disabled recruits did not report the

[1] See Table A2.13 for the methods reported in the previous survey. It appears that the use of each method has increased. However, the different sampling and data collection methods are likely to account for at least some of the difference. See the discussion in section 1.3.4 above.

Table 3.8 Methods used to attract applications from people with disabilities

	% using each method	
	Random sample (weighted)	Symbol users
Job advertisements welcoming disabled applicants	51.7	59.0
Specific request to Jobcentre/Careers Office	47.9	46.6
Notify PACT team, DRO, DAS, ERS	20.4	39.9
Use of disability Symbol	19.0	76.4
Contact with voluntary sector/charity	14.5	28.7
Contact with LENs for people with disabilities	13.8	24.7
Advertise without discrimination/want equal opportunities	12.5	1.1
Contact with CEPD	3.9	18.5
All respondents	134	178

Source: IES survey, 1994

use of the Symbol in this context, even in response to a read out list.

The most widely used methods of attracting applications were 'job advertisements welcoming disabled applicants' and 'specific request to Jobcentre/Careers Office', and the proportion mentioning each varied little between the two samples. 'PACTs, *etc.*' (Placing Assessment and Counselling Teams), 'contact with the voluntary sector and charities', 'contact with CEPD' (Committees for the Employment of People with Disabilities) and 'local employer networks' were all mentioned by higher proportions of the Symbol users sample. Becoming a Symbol user should bring employers into contact with at least some of these agencies, and it is possible that being a Symbol user reflects a broader concern with people with disabilities rather than being the cause of these different patterns of behaviour. It is also likely that all these agencies, *etc.* are likely to be in contact with and/or used by similar groups of employer (especially large employers who are over-represented in the Symbol users sample) rather than each of them having their own distinct audience.

The category 'advertising without discrimination/want equal opportunities' amongst the random sample deserves comment. All the previous categories were read out to respondents during the interview. This was the only one derived as a result of other, unprompted, answers. Its relative importance amongst the random sample suggests perhaps that a group of these employers take a different type of approach. Rather than targeting people with disabilities specifically, they take a broader and more general equal opportunities approach.

Chapter 2 discussed the lack of applications from people with

Table 3.9 Ease of attracting applications from disabled recruits

	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users %
Very easy	1.4	6.7
Easy	7.3	14.6
Neither easy nor difficult	43.4	29.2
Difficult	32.5	34.3
Very difficult	15.4	15.2
No. of respondents (=100%)	134	178

(All those actively trying to attract applications.)

Source: IES survey, 1994

disabilities, and actively attempting to attract applications from this group does not appear, from these results, to have met with much success. The majority of respondents who were active in this way reported that attracting disabled applicants was either difficult or very difficult (Table 3.9). Over 40 per cent of the random sample seemed neutral about their activities, reporting that it was neither easy nor difficult to attract such recruits. However, Symbol users did seem to have an advantage. Slightly over a fifth reported that it was easy, or very easy, to attract disabled applicants, compared to just over eight per cent of the random sample. This would seem to suggest that it is a package of measures which is important, not just attempts to attract applicants. Alternatively, it may reflect different perceptions and attitudes amongst the two groups (or indeed the larger average size, and therefore labour market visibility of the Symbol users group). Although the use of the Symbol itself on the job advert was likely to play a role, as argued in Chapter 7, some employers were using this Symbol to 'badge' existing good practice. They may be already known as 'good' employers and hence be likely to attract applications from people with disabilities.

To try and tease out more information about why some employers attract applications and others do not, further questions were asked about the reasons for it being easy or difficult to attract applicants. Numbers start becoming quite small in these questions and the responses are discussed generally rather than listed in a table. There was a difference between the type of responses given by Symbol users and those given by the random sample. Symbol users tended to give answers related to Symbol use and their proactive stance. They were most likely to report that 'many suitably qualified people have applied' (42 per cent or 16 cases). In some ways, this is not really an answer as to why it was easy to attract applicants but is perhaps indicative of there being something about Symbol users which renders them more attractive, or visible to people with disabilities in the labour market. Only three out of the 12 members of the random sample mentioned this reason. Those in

the random sample were most likely to mention that the type of work in question made it easy for them to employ people with disabilities (43 per cent: although this represented only five cases).

Despite specifically trying to attract applications from people with disabilities, most respondents in this category still did not find it easy to attract applications. The reasons given for this are not particularly enlightening. Sixty-five per cent of those in the random sample and 78 per cent of Symbol users explained their difficulties in terms of no one applying. This is not really surprising. Without talking to potential disabled applicants it is unlikely that employers will know the true reasons for a lack of applications. On the other hand, although people with disabilities are disproportionately represented amongst those without a job, their representation in the active population of working age is not so large that all employers could realistically expect regular applications from this group[1]. Furthermore, employers do not always know if applicants are disabled or not, and might reject them on other grounds before reaching the stage of interviewing and possibly finding this out. A minority (16 per cent of the random sample and 14 per cent of Symbol users) mentioned that applicants were not suited for the job on grounds other than their disability. Only two and three per cent respectively reported a person's disability as a barrier to recruitment.

3.3.2 Interviewing applicants

One of the commitments Symbol users sign up to is:

> 'To interview all applicants with a disability who meet the minimum criteria for a job vacancy and consider them on their abilities.'

However, there was no difference in the extent to which members of the two samples reported that they would try to do this: 96 per cent of each.[2] Of course, we have no way of knowing whether they actually do or not, and this is compounded by employers frequently not knowing whether applicants are disabled or not. Disabilities are varied in their nature and in the extent to which workplaces need to be adapted to cater for them. The next chapter explores the extent to which different types of disability are seen as a problem by employers. It could be that when it comes to

---

[1] It is well-documented (see, for example Honey, Meager and Williams (1993), Appendix 3) that the majority of disabled people out of work but who wish to work are 'economically inactive' rather than unemployed, and it is likely, therefore, that more active measures will be required to attract applications from this group than from many other groups in the population.

[2] The size and sector analysis did not reveal any clear patterns and is not presented here.

actual recruitment, the lack of a disability may influence the final decision between two equally well-qualified individuals.

3.3.3 Consultation at work

A further commitment made by Symbol users is to consult disabled employees at least once a year about what can be done to make sure they develop and use their abilities at work. Members of both samples who currently had disabled

Table 3.10 Consultation with disabled employees

(a) Whether consultation occurs on a regular basis

	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users %
Yes — formal discussion	7.6	28.2
Yes — informal discussion	49.9	46.0
No	42.4	25.8
No. of respondents (=100%)	533	213

(Only asked of those with disabled employees.)

(b) Regularity of consultation — if formal discussion

	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users %
Once a month	31.3	18.3
Once a quarter	20.1	25.0
Once every six months	15.3	18.3
Once a year	27.9	26.7
Less often	–	1.7
Don't know	5.4	10.0
No. of respondents (= 100%)	41	60

(c) Methods of consultation (formal & informal discussion)

	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users %
Informal discussions/'we just talk to them'	94.3	79.7
Annual or other appraisal interviews	5.8	10.8
Focus (discussion groups)	3.9	22.2
Trade unions	2.5	5.7
Others	1.4	0.6
Ad hoc surveys with anonymous questionnaires	1.2	1.9
Personal/named questionnaires sent to disabled employees	1.1	8.9
Staff or house journals	1.1	5.1
Staff attitude survey (type unknown)	1.1	1.9
Staff suggestion scheme	0.8	1.9
Exit interviews	–	0.6
No. of respondents (=100%)	307	126

Source: IES survey, 1993

employees were asked whether they consulted these employees on a regular basis about their needs at work and, if they did, how often and the methods used. Exploring whether Symbol users are different in this respect is possible only if there is some information about the activities of employers as a whole.

Consultation was more common amongst Symbol users than the random sample (Table 3.10a). Slightly over forty per cent of those in the random sample who had disabled employees did not consult these employees, compared with over a quarter of Symbol users. There was, therefore, a significant minority of Symbol users who did not seem to be keeping to their commitments. The majority of consultation was reported to take place on an informal basis, with some 46 per cent of Symbol users and about half the random sample reporting this.

The regularity of consultations varied (Table 3.10b). This question was asked only of respondents reporting formal discussion as, by definition, informal discussion tends to be *ad hoc* and possibly on-going. It appears that employers in the random sample were consulting more frequently but in nearly every establishment/organisation, consultation was happening at least once a year.

Although there is a range of possible means of consultation, the actual methods adopted were rather limited (Table 3.10c). The random sample relied almost completely on answers of the nature 'informal discussion/we just talk to them'. Symbol users also concentrated on this type of consultation but they were also more likely to have adopted more formal methods.

3.3.4 Retention of existing employees

Virtually every respondent reported that they would be prepared to take positive steps to retain an existing employee in employment if they became disabled (Table 3.11). Only 1.3 per cent of the random sample were not prepared to take any steps. The majority (90.4 per cent of Symbol users and 77.8 per cent of the random sample) reported unconditionally that they would be prepared to take steps. A minority qualified their answer saying it would depend on the job or disability in question (Table 3.11).

Table 3.11 The retention of existing employees who become disabled

	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users %
Would be prepared to retain existing employee	77.8	90.4
Would – depending on disability/job	20.9	9.6
Would not be prepared to	1.3	–
No. of respondents (=100%)	1,257	251

Source: IES survey, 1994

Table 3.12 Steps prepared to take to retain an existing employee who became disabled in employment, random sample (weighted) (per cent)

	Yes	No	Depends
Allow for special leave necessitated by disability	88.0	3.4	8.6
Train/re-train	81.2	9.0	9.8
Provide flexible working patterns	78.8	11.0	10.2
Provide additional on-the-job support	77.5	9.7	12.8
Employ job-sharing	65.1	26.9	8.1
Provide counselling	62.9	32.0	5.1
Modify workplace/premises	56.7	17.5	25.8
Provide special equipment	55.6	10.8	33.7
Use home working	16.8	77.6	5.6
Row percentage = 100% N = 1,241			

Source: IES survey, 1994

Those who reported being prepared to take any steps were asked which of the steps listed in Tables 3.12 and 3.13 they would be prepared to take. In virtually every situation, higher proportions of Symbol users were prepared to take the action in question. Symbol users were also less likely to qualify their answer by reporting that the action depended on the job/person/disability.

This fits with patterns described earlier. It appears that Symbol users are prepared to take or consider a wider range of actions than other employers. The only two steps on which the samples differed little, if at all, were in their preparedness to provide flexible working practices and to allow special leave necessitated by the disability.

Table 3.13 Steps prepared to take to retain an existing employee who became disabled in employment, Symbol users (per cent)

	Yes	No	Depends
Train/re-train	90.8	2.0	7.2
Provide additional on-the-job support	88.8	3.2	8.0
Allow for special leave necessitated by disability	86.5	4.4	9.2
Provide flexible working patterns	83.3	7.2	9.6
Provide counselling	82.9	13.9	3.2
Provide special equipment	82.9	1.6	15.5
Modify workplace/premises	81.7	6.8	11.6
Employ job- sharing	74.9	19.1	6.0
Use home working	29.5	59.0	11.6
Row percentage = 100% N = 251			

Source: IES survey, 1994

High proportions of Symbol users were prepared to take nearly all the steps mentioned. The only action they were really not keen on was home working: 59 per cent reported that they would not be prepared to provide/allow this. Job-sharing and providing counselling were also slightly less popular (19 per cent and 14 per cent respectively not being prepared to take such actions).

Members of the random sample were much less disposed towards providing special equipment or modifying the workplace/premises than were Symbol users. They were also much more likely to qualify their answer on these items. This could be, at least in part, because they have less experience, and hence knowledge, than Symbol users about the costs and impacts of such actions. In Chapter 5 these issues are discussed more generally in terms of what employers would offer to disabled recruits — rather than to existing employees becoming disabled — and in terms of the extent to which employers would be prepared to pay for such changes.

3.4 Summary

This chapter explored the extent to which respondents reported the existence of policies on the recruitment and employment of people with disabilities, and the nature of these policies:

- Forty-one per cent of organisations in the Symbol users sample and twelve per cent of establishments in the random sample had a written policy specifically addressing the employment of people with disabilities.
- It was most common, however, for the employment of people with disabilities to be addressed through general equal opportunities policies.
- Small establishments and organisations were less likely to have any form of policy addressing the employment of people with disabilities.
- Written policies tended to be broad in coverage, although recruitment and training and development were most frequently covered. Members of the Symbol users sample reported slightly higher coverage of most items.
- Seventy-one per cent of organisations in the Symbol users sample were actively attempting to attract applications from people with disabilities, compared with eleven per cent of establishments in the random sample.
- Symbol users seemed to be adopting a wider range of methods to attract applications and were slightly more likely to report that it was easy or very easy to attract applications from disabled people (21 per cent, compared to almost nine per cent of those in the random sample).

- The majority of respondents (96 per cent) in both samples reported that they interviewed all applicants with a disability who met the minimum criteria for a job vacancy, and considered them on their abilities.
- In just over 40 per cent of establishments in the random sample and a quarter of organisations in the Symbol users sample there was no regular consultation of disabled employees. Although Symbol users were more likely formally to consult any people with disabilities they employed, most consultation was reported to be fairly informal.
- Virtually all respondents reported that they would be prepared to take steps to retain an existing employee in employment if they became disabled.
- Throughout this chapter, organisations in the Symbol users sample were shown to be more likely to adopt positive policies and practices towards the employment of people with disabilities than were establishments in the random sample. However, a minority did not appear to be taking the actions they should have been in order to meet the conditions of being a Symbol user. There are a number of possible explanations for this: for example, the respondent may not have been fully aware of all the policies and practices adopted by the organisation, and information about Symbol use might not have been effectively communicated throughout the organisation.

4. Perceptions of, and Attitudes Towards People with Disabilities

The previous IES (IMS) report (Honey, Meager and Williams, 1993) explored in detail the perceived barriers to, and difficulties in employing people with disabilities. In this study we were able to ask only a limited number of questions about the extent to which respondents felt able to employ people with different types of disability, and the (perceived) difficulties associated with each. The list of disabilities used in the earlier postal survey had to be condensed and reduced due to pressures on time in a telephone interview. Nevertheless, the data are broadly comparable between the two studies.

4.1 Perceptions of the employability of people with different disabilities

A list of different types of disability and long-term health problems was read out and respondents were asked to report whether or not it would be possible to employ an individual with the disability in question in that establishment or organisation. In practice, many of the responses were not a straightforward 'yes' or 'no', and four categories of answer had to be coded:

- possible to employ someone with this type of disability in all jobs
- possible to employ someone with this type of disability in some jobs
- depends on the severity of the disability, and
- would not be possible to employ someone with this type of disability.

The extent to which respondents felt it possible to employ disabled people varied between the two samples and by type of disability. Some of the variation between samples can be explained by differences in sampling. The Symbol users sample was organisation-based and most (multi-establishment) organisations are likely to provide a wider range of jobs, types of premises, *etc.* than is an individual establishment. However, the differences in response were frequently quite large and may, at least in part, have been attributable to the greater awareness of

Table 4.1 Employment opportunities for people with different types of disability (per cent)

		All jobs	Some jobs	Depends	No
Disability affecting mobility	R	7.5	44.8	21.3	26.4
	S	17.1	55.8	16.3	10.8
Difficulty in seeing	R	3.4	26.9	18.5	51.2
	S	12.7	50.2	17.1	19.9
Difficulty in hearing	R	19.0	48.3	18.7	14.0
	S	29.1	57.0	10.8	3.2
Epilepsy	R	37.8	36.0	15.0	11.2
	S	47.0	37.8	13.1	2.0
Mental handicap/learning difficulties	R	6.3	36.8	26.3	30.6
	S	11.2	43.4	28.7	16.7
Depression/nervous & mental disorders	R	16.5	30.0	30.9	22.6
	S	24.7	37.5	26.7	11.2
Heart, circulation, chest & breathing problems	R	26.9	42.0	17.6	13.4
	S	32.3	36.6	15.9	5.2
Allergies & skin conditions	R	38.8	37.5	12.8	10.9
	S	41.4	44.2	10.0	4.4
Diabetes	R	84.4	11.8	3.6	0.1
	S	84.5	12.4	3.2	–

Key:
R = random sample (weighted); all respondents (N = 1,257)
S = Symbol users; all respondents (N = 251)

Source: IES survey, 1994

Symbol users of the potentials and needs of people with disabilities.

Table 4.1 shows the perceived employability of people with different disabilities reported by respondents in each sample. Less than a fifth of Symbol users felt it impossible to employ people with any one of the disabilities listed. People with difficulties in seeing were seen as the hardest to employ, by 19.9 per cent of Symbol users. Nevertheless, half reported being able to employ people with such difficulties in some jobs. People with mental handicap/learning difficulties were seen as difficult to employ by 16.7 per cent. These types of disability were possibly being seen as increasingly difficult to accommodate. Many employers require their employees to be able to communicate effectively with customers, read and write, *etc.* (Spilsbury, Dench and Williams, 1994). The number of jobs not requiring such abilities is declining and anyone perceived as having a difficulty in this area (whether or not the perception is a valid one) is likely to find it increasingly difficult to find employment.

Table 4.2 Percentage of each size band reporting it not possible to employ people with each disability, random sample (weighted) (per cent)

	11-24	25-49	50-99	100-199	200+	All
Disability affecting mobility	30.1	24.5	19.2	20.5	13.6	26.4
Difficulty in seeing	55.6	52.8	41.4	39.3	24.1	51.2
Difficulty in hearing	17.4	9.9	11.2	9.1	5.7	14.0
Epilepsy	13.9	8.1	8.7	6.7	3.7	11.2
Mental handicap/learning difficulties	31.4	30.7	31.7	27.3	19.5	30.6
Depression/nervous & mental disorders	26.4	18.5	20.8	16.0	9.1	22.6
Heart, circulation, chest & breathing problems	16.1	12.4	7.9	7.2	7.2	13.4
Allergies & skin problems	13.1	9.7	6.7	5.4	6.0	10.9
Diabetes	–	–	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.1
No. of respondents (=100%)	701	299	140	68	49	1,257

Source: IES survey, 1994

People with disabilities affecting mobility were seen as impossible to employ by only a tenth of Symbol users, and over half felt that some jobs were suitable for people so affected. This ranking of disabilities in terms of the difficulty of employing them differs slightly from the previous study, in which disabilities affecting mobility were reported to be causing by far the most difficulties[1].

The disabilities seen as least likely to cause problems for employment were difficulties in hearing, allergies and skin conditions, heart, circulation, chest and breathing problems, epilepsy and diabetes. Many of these would not really be considered as disabilities by some people. In their milder forms they cause no difficulties, and are frequently not even noticeable. The extent to which they cause difficulties in employment is likely to be limited to certain industries and jobs.

Respondents in the random sample were more likely than were Symbol users to see people with each type of disability as difficult to employ, although the general ranking was similar between samples. Difficulties in seeing and mental handicap/ learning difficulties were reported as impossible to employ in just over half and almost a third of establishments respectively. Around a quarter reported difficulties with mobility problems and depression/nervous and mental disorders. Respondents in the random sample were also slightly more likely to qualify their answers by saying 'it depended'. This may reflect a greater uncertainty or a lack of awareness of the potentials and needs of disabled people.

[1] See Table A2.18 in Appendix 2.

Table 4.3 Percentage of each size band reporting all or some jobs available to people with each disability, random sample (weighted) (per cent)

	11-24		25-49		50-99		100-199		200+		All	
	All	*Some*	*All*	*Some*	*All*	*Some*	*All*	*Some*	*All*	*Some*	*All*	*Some*
Disability affecting mobility	8.8	39.8	41.0	48.1	8.8	51.6	6.0	55.1	8.1	60.8	7.5	44.8
Difficulty in seeing	3.7	21.6	2.7	28.0	3.1	35.0	2.8	37.3	5.4	57.9	3.4	26.9
Difficulty in hearing	18.0	44.2	19.3	51.6	20.7	54.3	19.9	55.4	26.4	58.3	19.0	48.3
Epilepsy	36.2	34.0	41.5	34.7	37.9	40.8	37.3	42.3	38.4	50.6	37.8	36.0
Mental handicap/learning difficulties	6.4	33.5	6.1	39.2	7.5	40.2	3.4	42.4	6.9	51.6	6.3	36.8
Depression/nervous & mental disorders	17.1	25.2	15.3	35.0	15.0	35.4	16.6	35.9	20.0	44.1	16.5	30.0
Heart, circulation, chest & breathing problems	36.3	39.3	27.5	41.8	30.1	47.2	25.1	52.0	25.0	53.6	26.9	42.0
Allergies & skin problems	38.5	34.4	38.1	39.8	46.1	39.4	34.1	46.0	33.5	51.3	38.8	37.5
Diabetes	82.9	13.4	87.8	7.7	86.3	11.3	85.7	10.4	78.8	17.7	84.4	11.8
No. of respondents (N = 100%)	701		299		140		768		49		1,257	

Source: IES survey, 1994

Exploring this information by size and sector is complex because there are so many cells to consider. However, some general patterns are evident. Establishment size did not seem to have as strong an influence on perceptions about the employability of different types of disability as perhaps might have been expected. With the exception of diabetes, which was hardly seen as a problem by anyone, there was a general tendency for a lower proportion of respondents in larger establishments to see people with each type of disability as impossible to employ (Table 4.2). The proportion reporting that some jobs were suitable increased with size (Table 4.3).

Amongst Symbol users, the size pattern was very mixed and no clear patterns emerged. It was frequently in the smallest size band (under 25 employees) that the highest proportions were both reporting that all jobs were available to people with disabilities and that it would be impossible to employ such a person. This would suggest that it is not simply being small which predisposes an organisation to see problems with employing people with disabilities. Members of the Symbol users sample were all in some way self-selected. They had become Symbol users either because they were already active in the employment of people with disabilities, or because they were able to become so. The size relationships expected of a random group of employers are therefore likely to be overridden.

4.2 Why are people with some disabilities seen as difficult to employ?

Further questions were asked about the reasons why respondents reported it as not being possible to employ someone with certain disabilities. The overriding problem perceived related to the nature of the work in question[1], and this was true for all disabilities. There was some variation between disabilities in the other difficulties mentioned. Very small numbers of respondents amongst the Symbol users reported not being able to employ people with disabilities, and once these are broken down further the numbers generally become too small to be really useful. The analysis will, therefore, be confined to the random sample. However, it is perhaps worth noting that amongst Symbol users, any barriers to employing people with disabilities were mainly 'practical' in nature, relating to the nature of the work in particular, but also to safety issues and the nature of the premises. Hardly any adverse comments were made about the productivity, propensity to sick leave or personal characteristics of disabled people, nor about the attitudes of other employees towards disabled colleagues.

The following discussion draws only on comments made by respondents in the random sample. As will be seen, most barriers were practical in nature. However, a minority of respondents did make adverse comments relating to the personal characteristics and abilities of people with some types of disability. Whether these were based on personal experience or perceptions and prejudices is difficult to judge. It does appear, however, that a small group of employers have perhaps inaccurate perceptions of the effects of some disabilities. Even if based on personal experience, some bad impressions may be related to the individual rather than their disability but be 'blamed' on the disability by an employer.

The nature of the work emerged as the most commonly perceived barrier to the employment of people with disabilities (Table 4.4). Over 60 per cent of respondents reported this as a problem in relation to all disabilities, with the exception of epilepsy, where the percentage dropped to 43.9[2]. A large scale quantitative survey of this type is not the ideal vehicle for exploring particular problems associated with the nature of the work. However, respondents mentioning this difficulty were asked: 'What is the problem with the type of work here?' It was amongst these answers that some perhaps odd perceptions emerged.

---

[1] This reflects the findings of the previous survey (see Table A2.8 in Appendix 2).

[2] Diabetes is excluded from this analysis as virtually all respondents reported being able to provide some sort of employment for people with this type of disability.

The balance of response varied markedly by the type of disability (Table 4.5). A considerable number of answers were of a non-specific nature, such as 'the work is not suitable for people with this specific disability', and it was not possible to follow this up further. Being able to move around the shop floor, possibly between levels; the necessity for physical strength; and safety implications were all mentioned and the distribution of these responses between disabilities seems logical. The importance of communication skills was frequently mentioned in relation to difficulties in hearing, as with depression/nervous and mental disorders and mental handicap and learning difficulties. Too much pressure/stress was seen a problem in employing people with depression, *etc.* People with mental handicaps and learning difficulties were felt by a large proportion of those not regarding them as potential employees, to be lacking the necessary intelligence levels to conduct the work to the standards required.

It was mentioned above that the extent to which these views were based on experience of the actual disability is impossible to tell from a survey of this nature. Some views were likely to be based on prejudices and perceptions, possibly based on one bad experience. The lower level of difficulty reported by Symbol users might suggest that these employers in the random sample were less aware of, or less open to the needs of people with disabilities. Alternatively, it may be that employers who can more easily accommodate people with disabilities are most likely to sign up to Symbol use.

A further point to stress is that some of the comments seemed to suggest that changes in the working environment may act to the disadvantage of people with certain types of disability. For example, the importance of 'customer service' and the associated importance of communication skills is constantly emphasised by employers. People with certain types of disability may not be perceived as able to provide the desired level of service. The second most frequently mentioned problem varied between disabilities. In some cases it was safety implications, and in others the difficulties in adapting premises (Table 4.4).[1] Respondents mentioning difficulties in adapting premises were asked to expand on this. Responses were fairly predictable. The existence of too many stairs, the lack of lifts, poor access and dangerous machinery were most frequently mentioned.

[1] See also Table A2.8 in Appendix 2. Difficulties with premises were the second most frequently mentioned in this earlier study. It is interesting that safety implications did not feature as a separate category.

Table 4.4 Barriers to the employment of specific disabilities, random sample (weighted) (per cent)

	Disability affecting mobility	Difficulty in seeing	Difficulty in hearing	Epilepsy	Mental handicap/ learning difficulties	Depression/ nervous & mental disorders	Heart, circulation, chest & breathing problems	Allergies & skin conditions
Cost of adapting premises	5.0	0.1	–	–	1.1	1.0	–	1.6
Not practical/possible to adapt premises	27.4	3.5	1.7	1.9	2.1	0.2	8.2	0.1
Equipment unsuitable – too difficult/costly to adapt or replace	13.9	19.5	14.2	17.3	7.1	10.6	13.4	9.3
Nature of the work was unsuitable	64.2	70.6	72.2	43.9	75.3	67.3	60.5	62.9
Supervision/management costs	0.2	1.0	0.4	1.9	3.6	2.7	0.5	–
Safety implications	23.3	22.9	20.0	59.8	13.2	24.2	26.5	36.0
Productivity too low	0.2	1.7	–	–	5.7	6.0	0.1	–
Sick leave a problem	–	–	–	–	–	2.4	0.2	0.4
Attitudes of other staff/managers	–	–	–	–	0.3	3.1	–	–
Training costs	–	–	–	–	0.5	0.4	–	–
Attitude/temperament of person with disability	0.1	–	0.6	0.4	1.0	6.5	–	–
No. of respondents (=100%)	330	655	176	140	385	261	169	137

Source: IES survey 1994

Table 4.5 Problems with the type of work (per cent)

	Disability affecting mobility	Difficulty in seeing	Difficulty in hearing	Epilepsy	Mental handicap/ learning difficulties	Depression/ nervous & mental disorders	Heart, circulation, chest & breathing problems	Allergies & skin conditions
Ability to communicate essential	2.3	5.4	54.8	4.4	16.8	24.0	3.5	0.8
Work intricate/labour intensive	4.2	15.1	2.2	3.8	8.0	1.2	1.0	–
Ability to move on shop floor/between levels essential	45.2	6.8	3.6	–	2.1	0.3	24.1	–
Physical strength/lifting required	32.2	2.2	0.3	1.9	1.3	–	49.1	–
Unsafe for disabled person/other workers	5.7	16.2	18.4	42.0	7.8	9.5	10.4	18.7
Legislation prevents disabled person from working here	0.7	0.2	2.3	5.0	0.6	2.8	–	30.2
Work not suitable for people with specific disabilities	33.8	72.2	43.6	34.1	34.7	51.2	47.3	80.9
Certain intelligence level required to meet accuracy standards	0.5	6.4	–	–	42.6	9.4	2.7	–
Would depend on the extent of the disability	2.0	4.2	3.2	4.4	9.1	1.8	5.9	5.7
Too much pressure/stress	–	–	–	–	1.7	21.6	4.8	–
Work involves dealing with group of people with special needs eg children/elderly/disabled	8.4	6.5	3.0	25.4	7.6	9.4	6.6	5.0
No. of respondents (=100%)	205	448	121	61	288	174	93	81

Source: IES survey, 1994

Amongst respondents reporting difficulties in employing people with mobility and seeing problems, the impossibility of adapting premises featured quite highly. The cost of adapting premises was rarely mentioned[1].

Supervision/management costs, low productivity costs, training costs, sick leave and attitudinal problems were rarely mentioned[2]. It was only when thinking about people with a mental handicap/learning difficulty, or depression/nervous and mental disorders that these began to be commented on more frequently, although still by only a small proportion of respondents. These two categories grouped together a wide range of disabilities of varying severity and with differing implications for employability. They were also less easily understood by employers, and the use of these words tended to conjure up the more extreme views of such disabilities. Nevertheless, the comments do illustrate the ways in which people with these disabilities were commonly viewed.

4.3 Summary

This chapter explored respondents' perceptions of the employability of people with different types of disability. In summary:

- Respondents in the Symbol users sample were less likely than those in the random sample to report that it was impossible to employ people with the different disabilities listed. However, the general order of perceived difficulty of employing people with each disability did not vary much between the two samples.
- People with difficulties in seeing were seen as the hardest to employ, followed by people with mental handicap/learning difficulties.
- People with difficulties in hearing, allergies and skin conditions, heart, circulation, chest and breathing problems, epilepsy and diabetes were least likely to be seen as difficult to employ.
- Most barriers to the employment of people with disabilities were practical in nature, relating to the nature of the work and the actions required to do the work.

---

[1] This question was open-ended and responses were not prompted. A different emphasis might have emerged if respondents had been taken through a prepared list. However, these impromptu answers do give a picture of the issues which immediately appear as problems to employers.

[2] These types of problems were mentioned more frequently in the previous study (Table A2.8, Appendix 2).

- Very few respondents commented adversely on the abilities and attitude of people with disabilities, although it appears that a small group of employers in the random sample did hold such views.
- Some of the comments made during the interviews suggest that changes in the working environment may be operating to the disadvantage of people with disabilities. For example, communication skills are required by many customer-orientated businesses and people with certain disabilities may be perceived to lack these. There is no evidence, however, to suggest whether these perceptions are fully based on experience or are rooted in prejudice.

5. Making Accommodation for Disabled Staff

In this chapter, we examine the extent to which employers were prepared to adjust the working environment or make changes to working practices to help accommodate the needs of disabled employees. We also look at employers' willingness to pay for such changes.

5.1 Preparedness to accommodate disabled staff

Survey respondents were asked what their organisations would be prepared to do in order to recruit, employ or retain a disabled person. In order to provide a common structure for analysing responses, the question posed respondents with a number of concrete examples, distinguishing between:

- making 'some changes to working practices that have no cost, such as a change in starting time, working hours or the structure of breaks'
- making 'a minor change to the working environment, such as moving furniture; interviewing (*potential recruits*) and providing accommodation on the ground floor'
- being prepared to 'pay the cost of any adaptations or alterations necessary in working practices, equipment used, the premises or working environment more generally'.

Table 5.1 summarises the responses to this question.

On the face of it, the table suggests a high degree of willingness on the part of the employers surveyed to make and pay for

Table 5.1 Preparedness to accommodate disabled staff

Accommodation	Random sample (weighted) (% of respondents)	Symbol users sample (% of respondents)
Costless changes to working practices	81.6	94.0
Minor change to working environment	78.9	97.2
Pay cost of adaptations necessary	68.1	83.7
Non response	—	—
No. of respondents (=100%)	1,257	251

Source: IES Survey, 1994

Table 5.2 Preparedness to accommodate disabled staff, by establishment/organisation size random sample (weighted)

Size	Accommodation (% of respondents) Costless changes to working practices	Minor change to working environment	Pay cost of necessary adaptations	Total (N=100%)
11 to 24	80.6	74.1	64.0	701
25 to 49	82.4	82.6	68.8	299
50 to 99	80.0	83.9	75.3	140
100 to 199	85.7	91.0	80.3	68
200 plus	89.3	94.2	86.2	49
				1,257
	Symbol users sample			
1 to 24	92.6	96.3	63.0	27
25 to 49	84.6	92.3	80.8	26
50 to 99	96.2	100.0	92.3	26
100 to 199	89.3	96.4	82.1	28
200 plus	96.8	98.4	87.3	126
				233

Source: IES Survey, 1994

changes necessary to recruit, employ or retain people with disabilities. Among Symbol users, preparedness to make costless changes to working practices or minor changes to the working environment was almost universal, and 84 per cent of Symbol users claimed a willingness to pay for necessary adaptations or alterations. As expected, willingness to make and pay for such accommodations was less widespread among respondents in the random sample, but nevertheless over two thirds of this group were apparently willing to pay for necessary adaptations/ alterations.

Table 5.2 looks at variation between organisation/establishment size in respondents' preparedness to accommodate disabled staff. Among the random sample, there was, for each of the three examples given, a clear tendency for the proportion prepared to make the accommodation in question to increase with establishment size. This tendency was particularly marked for accommodations involving some cost.

Among Symbol users, there was no such pattern — the only notable variation from the generally high level of willingness to accommodate disabled staff, occurred amongst the very smallest

organisations (under 25 employees), of whom less than two thirds stated a willingness to pay for adaptations[1].

Care must, of course, be exercised in interpreting these findings. The question was couched in very general terms, and this willingness, in principle, to make accommodation for disabled employees, and to pay if necessary, cannot be interpreted as a unlimited preparedness to make and pay for *any* changes, whatever their nature, and however large their cost. This need for caution is reinforced by the responses to subsequent questions, which explored employers' 'willingness to pay' in more detail.

5.2 Willingness to pay to accommodate disabled staff

Respondents who indicated (see Table 5.1 above) that they would be prepared to pay for necessary adaptations/alterations were asked:

> *'How much would you be prepared to pay for the cost of making any adaptations or alterations necessary to take on a disabled person?'*

and their responses are summarised in Table 5.3.

The first point to note is that a significant minority of those respondents who had said that they would be willing to pay for such adaptations/alterations in principle, could not or would not answer this question at all. The proportion not answering was just under a quarter among the random sample, and nearly 40 per cent among Symbol users. It is not possible to identify the reasons for non-response, but it is interesting to note the higher proportion of Symbol users in this category. Given their generally greater experience of employing disabled people, and more fully articulated policies on these issues, this may reflect a greater understanding among this group of the difficulty of making a general response to this type of question[2].

Equally notable is the fact that of those responding to the question, only a very small minority of both samples could easily specify the sum they would be prepared to pay for the necessary adaptations/alterations. Thus, from the random sample 18 per cent of those prepared to pay for such changes

---

1 The data were also explored for sectoral variations in response to this question, but no clear patterns emerged, and the findings are not, therefore, reported here.

2 Similar difficulties in answering cost questions were reported in the previous IES study (Honey, Meager and Williams *op. cit.*), where the evidence suggested that non-response did not imply that there were no limits to employers' willingness to pay for the necessary accommodations, but rather that they were often not prepared to specify such limits in the abstract.

Table 5.3 Willingness to pay for adaptations/alterations necessary to employ a disabled person

How much prepared to pay?	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users sample %
Less than £100	1.8	1.9
£100 to 1,000	12.3	7.1
£1,001 to 2,500	2.0	2.9
£2,500 to 5,000	1.6	1.4
More than £5,000	0.8	1.4
Total specifying sum	*18.4*	*14.8*
Depends on person	22.2	24.3
Depends on disability	16.2	23.3
Depends on job	21.0	27.6
Up to head office	21.2	8.6
Other reason	1.5	4.3
Question not answered	26.6	39.0
No. of respondents (=100%)	857	210

NB: responses total to more than 100% (multiple responses possible to some parts of question)

Source: IES Survey, 1994

specified a sum, and the figure for Symbol users was even smaller at 15 per cent.

Given the small numbers of respondents, it is not possible to attach great significance to the precise sums specified, although it is notable that between a half and two thirds of those specifying a sum in the two samples said that they would be prepared to pay between £100 and £1,000[1]. There was only a small tendency (despite their larger organisational size and more pro-active disability policies) for Symbol users to specify larger sums than their counterparts in the random sample.

Table 5.4 shows the size breakdown of 'willingness to pay' for that minority of respondents (158 in all) from the random sample who cited a sum. Care should be exercised in interpreting this table, given the small numbers in some of the size categories, but the table does, nevertheless, suggest some tendency for the amount respondents are prepared to pay to increase with establishment size.

[1] It is worth noting that these figures are broadly consistent with the average values of the maximum extra costs acceptable to employers reported in the previous IES survey, all of which lay between £300 and £900 — see Table A.2.23 in Appendix 2 below.

Table 5.4 Willingness to pay for adaptations/alterations by establishment/organisation size, random sample (weighted)

	How much prepared to pay? (% of respondents in size group)					
Size	Less than £100	£100 to £1,000	£1,001 to £2,500	£2,500 to £5,000	More than £5,000	Total (N=100%
11 to 24	9.2	71.6	6.4	12.8		84
25 to 49	8.8	68.7	11.5	2.9	8.1	39
50 to 99	13.5	51.4	21.6	2.7	10.7	19
100 to 199	5.0	58.2	19.2	7.5	10.1	11
200 plus	7.4	37.0	18.2	18.9	18.6	5
						158

Source: IES Survey, 1994

In the random sample about a fifth of respondents who would be prepared to pay in principle, said that the amount they would pay would be determined not at the level of the establishment, but at the head office of the organisation in question. The proportion of Symbol users giving this response was much smaller — not surprisingly, given the larger average size of respondents in this group, and the fact that many of the respondents were responding on behalf of the whole organisation rather than a particular establishment.

In both samples, the largest groups of respondents to this question said in response that *'it depends . . .'*. When asked what the amount they would be prepared to pay 'depended' on, similar proportions suggested that it would depend on:

- the person in question
- the disability in question, or
- the job in question[1].

This group of respondents who said that the amount that they would be prepared to pay was dependent on one or more of these three factors were further requested to make a rough estimate of the amount they would pay. Responses to this further questioning are set out in Table 5.5.

Nearly two thirds of respondents in this group were not able even to make a rough estimate of the amount they would be prepared to pay to accommodate a disabled employee.

Among those who did make such an estimate, the pattern is similar to that shown in the previous table, with the largest

[1] Once again this is broadly consistent with the findings on the cost questions in the previous IES survey (Honey, Meager and Williams *op cit.*).

Table 5.5 Estimates of preparedness to pay among respondents stating that sum would depend on person, job or disability in question

How much prepared to pay?	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users sample %
Less than £100	4.4	3.9
£100 to 1,000	20.5	25.3
£1,001 to 2,500	5.2	2.6
£2,501 to 5000	2.2	3.9
More than £5,000	2.4	3.9
Don't know	65.4	60.4
No. of respondents (=100%)	500	93

Source: IES Survey, 1994

category of respondents stating that they would be prepared to pay between £100 and £1,000. The proportions prepared to pay more than this were relatively small — just under ten per cent of the random sample, and just over ten per cent of the Symbol users sample (again it is notable that there was only a slight tendency for Symbol users to be prepared to pay a larger amount).

Table 5.6 combines the information from Tables 5.3 and 5.5 in order to make an overall estimate for the sample as a whole of the amounts respondents would be prepared to pay. It should again be stressed that this information is available only for a minority of respondents (*ie* about 40 per cent of those stating a general willingness to pay), and that for the bulk of these the information is very much a rough estimate, obtained through persistent questioning.

The general conclusion on willingness to pay, therefore, is that in so far as respondents were able to make estimates, there was a

Table 5.6 Overall estimates of willingness to pay for adaptations/alterations

	Random sample (weighted)		Symbol users sample	
How much prepared to pay?	% of those specifying sum	% of all those willing to pay	% of those specifying sum	% of all those willing to pay
Less than £100	11.2	4.3	10.9	4.8
£100 to 1,000	62.5	24.2	58.7	25.7
£1,001 to 2,500	13.0	5.0	10.9	4.8
£2,501 to 5,000	7.6	2.9	9.8	4.3
More than £5,000	5.7	2.2	9.8	4.3
No. of respondents (=100%)	331	857	92	210

Source: IES Survey, 1994

Table 5.7 Preparedness to pay more to retain an established employee

Pay more to retain established employee who becomes disabled than for a new recruit?	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users sample %
Yes	67.8	62.9
Depends on quality of established employee	18.6	19.0
No	13.5	18.1
Non response	—	—
No. of respondents (=100%)	857	210

Source: IES Survey, 1994

concentration of responses in the £100 to £1,000 range[1], and little evidence that the (presumed 'good practice') employers in the Symbol users sample were prepared to pay significantly more than their counterparts in the random sample.

5.3 Willingness to pay for accommodation for existing employees

Previous research[2] has shown a willingness among employers to pay more to make accommodation for an existing employee who becomes disabled in the course of their employment with the organisation, than for a (potential) recruit who is already disabled. Respondents to the present survey who indicated that they would in principle be prepared to pay for adaptations/ alterations for a disabled person (see Table 5.1 above) were asked, therefore, whether they would be prepared to pay more to retain an established employee who becomes disabled than for a new recruit. Table 5.7 summarises the responses.

The table confirms that the majority (around two thirds) would be prepared to pay more for an existing employee, whilst for just under 20 per cent it would depend on the perceived value of the employee to the organisation, and for only a small minority (around 15 per cent of the overall sample) it would make no difference. Of some interest is the fact that the Symbol users would be slightly less likely, on average, than employers from the random sample, to pay more for an existing employee than for a new recruit. This may reflect the fact that as organisations with better-developed policies on disability, Symbol users were less likely to favour one group over another; alternatively, among

[1] Again broadly consistent with the results of the previous IES survey (see Appendix 2, Table A.2.23).

[2] See Honey, Meager and Williams *op. cit.*, pp 98-99. These earlier results were, however, heavily influenced by the inclusion of larger 'good practice' organisations in the sample, and the results from the random, re-weighted sample from the 1993 survey show a generally lower percentage of respondents willing to pay more, a percentage that is considerably lower than that recorded in the present survey (See Appendix 2, Tables A.2.24 and A.2.25).

Table 5.8 Willingness to pay for adaptations or alterations necessary to retain an existing employee who becomes disabled

How much prepared to pay?	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users sample %
Less than £100	1.8	0.0
£100 to 1,000	12.6	8.1
£1,001 to 2,500	6.2	9.3
£2,500 to 5,000	4.0	8.1
More than £5,000	2.6	2.3
Total specifying sum	*27.2*	*27.9*
Depends on person	17.1	20.3
Depends on disability	11.5	18.0
Depends on job	14.4	19.8
Up to head office	19.8	5.2
Other reason	1.3	4.1
Question not answered	27.1	36.0
No. of respondents (=100%)	741	172

NB: responses total to more than 100% (multiple responses possible to some parts of question)

Source: IES Survey, 1994

the smaller establishments in the random sample, personal knowledge of, and/or sympathy for an existing employee who becomes disabled, may have been more likely to carry weight in the decision.

Among the random sample, the preparedness to pay more to retain existing employees did not vary in any systematic way with establishment size[1] (across all the five size groups used for the study, the proportion saying they would pay more for established employees varied between 65 and 69 per cent). Among the Symbol users there was greater variation, but no clear pattern, and the small numbers in individual size groups prevent strong conclusions being drawn here.

Respondents who indicated that they would pay more for an established employee (either unconditionally, or depending on the 'quality' of the person in question) were then asked, as before, how much they would be prepared to pay to make

[1] Again, this result is somewhat at variance with the findings of the previous survey, where the preparedness to pay more for an existing employee tended to increase with organisation size (see Appendix 2 — Table A.2.24) but it is possible that the different basis of the two samples (establishment and organisation respectively may affect the comparability of these findings).

accommodation for an existing employee — Table 5.8 sets out the responses to this question.

Not surprisingly, the results are rather similar to those in Table 5.3 above, with around a third of respondents (more in the Symbol users sample than the random sample) not being willing/able to respond to the question, and only a minority (just over a quarter) being prepared to specify an amount. Among the latter group the distribution of amounts specified is rather similar to that in Table 5.3. In the random sample in particular, there was a concentration in the £100 to £1,000 range, suggesting that such employers would not be prepared to pay significantly larger sums for existing employees than for new recruits. Among the Symbol users, there was a greater concentration in the higher cost ranges, but once again the small numbers involved suggest caution in drawing conclusions here.

Those who said that the amount that they would be prepared to pay for an existing employee 'depended' (on the job, disability, person *etc.* in question), were encouraged again, nevertheless, to attempt to give an approximate estimate of this amount. Most of these respondents were not, however, able to give such an estimate, and rather than present these responses separately, Table 5.9 combines them with the responses of those specifying sums given in Table 5.8, to give an overall estimate of willingness to pay for accommodations for established employees. Table 5.9 is, therefore, analogous to Table 5.6 above, and the same *caveats* (regarding non-response, and the approximate nature of the estimates given) apply.

Table 5.9 suggests a somewhat greater difference among the relevant respondents between the amounts they would be prepared to pay in general, and the amounts they would be prepared to pay for existing employees becoming disabled. Thus comparing the data with those in Table 5.6, we find that among respondents from the random sample, some 26 per cent (of those specifying a sum) were prepared to pay more than £1,000 for a

Table 5.9 Overall estimates of willingness to pay for adaptations/alterations necessary to retain an existing employee who becomes disabled

	Random sample (weighted)		Symbol users sample	
How much prepared to pay?	% of those specifying sum	% of all those willing to pay	% of those specifying sum	% of all those willing to pay
Less than £100	5.4	1.9	1.4	0.6
£100 to 1,000	48.3	16.9	28.2	11.6
£1,001 to 2,500	20.8	7.3	39.4	16.3
£2,501 to 5,000	13.9	4.9	22.5	9.3
More than £5,000	11.6	4.1	8.5	3.5
No. of respondents (=100%)	259	741	71	172

Source: IES Survey, 1994

disabled recruit/employee, whereas Table 5.9 shows that of those prepared to pay more for existing employees (and specifying a sum) 46 per cent would pay more than £1,000.

Among Symbol users the difference is even greater, with Table 5.6 suggesting that 30 per cent (of those specifying a sum) would pay more than £1,000 in general, and Table 5.9 showing that this rises to 70 per cent among those who would pay more for existing employees becoming disabled. Thus although Table 5.7 suggested that Symbol users were somewhat less likely than firms in general to distinguish between existing employees and new recruits, it would seem that when they *do* make such a distinction, their preparedness to pay more for existing employees was considerably greater than average.

5.4 Summary

- Almost all Symbol users were prepared to make costless changes to working practices or minor changes to the working environment in order to employ/retain an employee with a disability, and 84 per cent reported a willingness to pay for any necessary adaptations or alterations.
- Willingness to make and pay for such accommodations was less widespread among respondents in the random sample than among Symbol users. Nevertheless, over two-thirds of the latter reported being willing to pay for any necessary changes.
- A significant minority of respondents reporting a willingness to pay to accommodate disabled recruits, could or would not report how much they would be willing to pay. In both samples, the largest group of respondents said 'it depends', on the person, the disability, and the job. The largest category of respondents comprised those prepared to pay between £100 and £1,000, and there was some tendency for the amount they were prepared to pay to increase with establishment/ organisational size. There was little evidence to suggest that employers in the Symbol users sample were prepared to pay significantly more than their counterparts in the random sample.
- The majority of respondents were prepared to pay more to accommodate an existing employee who becomes disabled during the course of their employment, than for a recruit who was already disabled. Only a small minority felt that it would make no difference.

6. Employer use of Information/Advice Sources on Disability

One objective of the survey was to establish the extent to which employers were aware of, and made use of the various sources of information, advice and support on disability issues, and to assess their perceptions of the value of these sources.

6.1 Awareness of and contact with main information/advice sources

Respondents were asked firstly whether they were aware of, and secondly whether they had had any contact with[1] any of the following potential sources of information/advice on the employment of people with disabilities:

- The various disability services provided through the Employment Service, particularly: Placing Assessment and Counselling Teams (PACTs), Disability Employment Advisers (DEAs) and their predecessors (*eg* Disabled Resettlement Advisers [DROs], Disabled Advisory Service [DAS], Employment Rehabilitation Service [ERS])
- The Employment Service's 'Major Organisations Development Unit' (MODU)
- The Employment Service's 'Access to Work' (AtW) programme, or the previous 'Special Schemes' provisions subsidising aids and adaptations for those employing disabled people
- Local 'Committees for the Employment of People with Disabilities' (CEPDs)
- Local Employer Networks on disability, including those set up by local authorities
- The national Employers' Forum on Disability (EFD)
- Training and Enterprise Councils (TECs).

[1] The question about whether there had been contact with a particular source was asked only of those respondents claiming awareness of at least one source.

Table 6.1 Awareness of/contact with main sources of information/advice

	Random sample (weighted)		
Source of info./advice	Aware of source %	Had contact with source %	No. having contact as % of no. aware
DEAs, PACTs *etc.*	50.1	20.7	33.7
MODU	4.8	1.0	18.0
AtW/Special Schemes	23.3	4.0	14.0
CEPD	16.1	2.1	10.9
LENs	23.2	8.2	28.9
EFD	10.0	2.3	18.3
TECs	70.5	33.8	39.2
None	18.2	52.0	–
Don't know	0.1	1.9	–
No. of respondents (=100%)	1,257	1,026*	–

	Symbol users sample		
Source of info./advice	Aware of source %	Had contact with source %	No. having contact as % of no. aware
DEAs, PACTs *etc.*	88.8	72.0	78.5
MODU	12.7	7.4	56.3
AtW/Special Schemes	57.0	28.4	48.3
CEPD	46.6	26.7	55.6
LENs	50.6	25.1	48.0
EFD	35.9	18.5	50.0
TECs	88.8	59.7	65.0
None	3.2	9.9	–
Don't know	0.0	2.1	–
No. of respondents (=100%)	251	243*	–

** Note the total number of respondents in the contact column exclude those who responded 'none' or 'don't know' to the awareness question*

Source: IES Survey, 1994

The responses to these questions are summarised in Table 6.1.

The table shows, as might be expected, considerably greater levels of awareness of, and contact with each source of advice among Symbol users than among the random sample. Awareness among Symbol users of PACTs and/or MODU might be expected to be 100 per cent, given that, depending on the size of the organisation, these are the main mechanisms through which Symbol use is marketed and awarded. From the table this appears at first sight to be the case, with 88.8 per cent aware of PACTs and 12.7 per cent aware of MODU. Further analysis, however, shows that there is some overlap here, with the result

Table 6.2 Awareness of main sources of information/advice, by establishment size, random sample (weighted)

	Aware of source (% of respondents in size group)				
	Size (no. of employees)				
Source of info./advice	11-24	25-49	50-99	100-199	200 plus
DEAs, PACTs *etc.*	46.9	47.2	55.0	66.2	79.6
MODU	4.6	4.7	4.3	5.9	8.2
AtW/Special Schemes	17.8	27.8	30.0	30.9	46.9
CEPD	14.3	14.4	22.1	19.1	30.6
Local Employer Networks	19.1	24.4	30.0	30.9	42.9
EFD	9.1	7.7	14.3	13.2	22.4
TECs	66.9	70.6	78.6	82.3	81.6
None	20.2	19.1	14.3	8.8	8.2
No. of respondents (=100%)	701	299	140	68	49

Source: IES Survey, 1994

that some 10.4 per cent of Symbol users claim to be aware of neither of these[1].

Among the random sample, awareness of TECs was greater than awareness of any of the other sources. TECs are, however, unique among the sources listed in not being disability-specific, and such awareness may equally have come about through TECs' other roles in training provision and enterprise support, so we cannot conclude from these results that TECs constitute the main, or even the primary source of advice/support on disability issues *per se*. About half of the random sample were aware of DEAs/PACTs, suggesting a relatively high level of market penetration here. Around a quarter had heard of Access to Work and Local Employer Networks on disability, and the lowest levels of awareness were of the CEPD, the Employers' Forum on Disability and MODU. Lack of awareness of EFD and MODU is unsurprising, given these organisations' focus on larger organisations, and that small establishments predominate in the random sample.

The ranking of sources in terms of awareness levels was similar among the Symbol users. Apart from the almost universal awareness of PACTs/MODU, TECs were the best known potential advice sources on the list, followed by Access to Work and Local Employer Networks (each being cited by over half the responding Symbol users). Slightly fewer than half were aware of CEPDs, and just over a third mentioned the Employers' Forum.

[1] It is, of course, possible that the individual survey respondent in some of these organisations may not have been personally involved with the original take-up of the Symbol, and hence not aware of the role of PACTs/MODU in this.

Table 6.2 breaks down by establishment size the responses on awareness for respondents in the random sample. As might be expected, general awareness of most of the sources tended to increase with establishment size.

Returning to Table 6.1, this also looks at the extent to which awareness of each source was reflected in actual contact with the source in question. Among the random sample, the highest ratio of contact to awareness (nearly 40 per cent) was recorded by TECs (but again it cannot be assumed that such contact was purely or primarily concerned with disability issues, rather than one or more of the many other functions of TECs). DEAs/PACTs were second on the list, recording a contact to awareness ratio of a third, suggesting that their relatively high market visibility was also reflected in relatively high use levels. Local Employer Networks, despite not being widely known (less than a quarter of employers were aware of them) appeared to achieve a relatively high contact rate among those aware of them (just under 30 per cent). Contact with the Access to Work programme and its predecessors was lower at 14 per cent, and the lowest contact to awareness ratio was achieved by the local CEPDs (*ie* not only had a mere one in six respondents heard of their local CEPD, but of those who had, only one in ten had had any contact with it).

Among Symbol users, contact to awareness ratios were not only much higher for all sources than among the random sample (close to 50 per cent or more in all cases), but were also less variable between the sources. This suggests (again not surprisingly, given the nature of Symbol use), that Symbol users are more likely than employers in general not only to be aware of the different sources of advice and information, but to make much more extensive use (than other employers) of those sources of which they are aware.

6.2 Other sources of advice, information and assistance

Respondents were asked whether they had sought advice, information or assistance on the employment of disabled people from any other organisations. Those who had sought such support were asked where they sought it, and those who had not, were asked why not. Table 6.3 summarises the responses. The small number of respondents involved must be borne in mind when considering these data.

The table shows a much higher use of other sources of support among Symbol users than among the random sample (over two thirds, and eleven per cent respectively). The specific sources used by the two groups were, however, similar, with the voluntary sector leading the field, followed by the Jobcentre and the local authority, and then at some distance, by a diverse range of other organisations.

Table 6.3 Use of other sources of advice/information/assistance

Other sources used?	Random sample (weighted) %		Symbol users sample %	
Yes	11.0		37.8	
Which sources?		*% (of users)*		*% (of users)*
Jobcentre		*29.9*		*23.4*
Local authority		*18.9*		*11.7*
Voluntary sector/charity		*39.9*		*42.6*
DSS		*1.5*		*1.1*
HSE		*0.4*		*1.1*
Occupational health officer		*2.3*		*2.1*
Remploy		*1.0*		*5.3*
Local education authority		*0.8*		*0.0*
ACAS		*0.1*		*0.0*
Personnel office (internal)		*1.3*		*1.1*
Employment Dept		*1.1*		*1.1*
Training college		*2.1*		*2.1*
Other		*8.8*		*8.5*
Don't know		*1.0*		*3.2*
TOTAL		*138*		*94*
No	83.3		59.4	
Why not?		*% (of non-users)*		*% (of non-users)*
No need for info./no disabled employees/not relevant		*73.7*		*49.3*
Little/no recruitment/no vacancies		*13.1*		*7.4*
No suitable jobs available		*6.3*		*2.0*
Have all the info. needed		*8.0*		*37.8*
Don't know where to go for info.		*2.2*		*1.4*
Not respondent's responsibility		*2.9*		*2.7*
New to the job		*0.8*		*0.7*
No discrimination in organisation		*1.9*		*0.0*
Too busy		*0.3*		*0.0*
Other		*0.2*		*0.0*
Don't know		*1.5*		*4.1*
TOTAL		*1,047*		*148*
Dealt with at head office	4.2		1.6	
Don't know	1.5		1.2	
No. of respondents (=100%)	1,257		251	

Source: IES Survey, 1994

Also of interest is the fact that Symbol users were not only much less likely than firms in general not to have sought such help or advice, but when they had not sought it, the reasons given were somewhat different than those given by respondents in the random sample. Thus Symbol users were much less likely than firms in general to say that they had not sought advice/support because they had no need for information, had no disabled employees, or thought the issues were irrelevant to them. On the other hand, they were more likely to say that they had not sought such information because they felt they already had all the information they required. The overall picture, therefore, as expected, is one of Symbol users being more aware of their needs for information/advice/support than firms in general, but also being generally better informed on disability issues than their counterparts in the random sample.

6.3 Contact with PACTs, DEAs *etc.*

Of particular interest in the study was employer awareness of and contact with Placement, Assessment and Counselling Teams (PACTs), with Disability Employment Advisers (DEAs), or with their predecessors (DRO, DAS, ERS *etc.*). We saw above that market penetration appeared relatively high (with around half of the sample aware of PACTs/DEAs). Further analysis shows that those who were aware of PACTs/DEAs were more likely to employ people with disabilities than those who were not aware of them (48 per cent of the former group and 36 per cent of the latter group had disabled employees). Further, of those who were aware of PACTs/DEAs, those who had actually had contact with them were more likely to employ disabled people, than those who had not (64 per cent and 41 per cent respectively).

Table 6.4 provides a more detailed size and sectoral breakdown of responses on this issue, from respondents in the random sample.

Looking first at size, the table shows that not only does awareness of PACTs/DEAs increase strongly with establishment size (from 47 to 80 per cent of respondents between the smallest and largest size categories respectively), but also that the 'contact rate' (*ie* the 'success' of PACTs/DEAs in turning employer awareness into direct contact) increases with size in a similar fashion[1]. This suggests that these services may be having least success in converting awareness into contact among employers, who, in the light of their attitudes towards and employment of people with disabilities, might most benefit from them. (Chapter 2 above has confirmed that the likelihood of

[1] Although the contact rate is lowest in the second smallest size category (25 to 49 employees), at under a quarter.

Table 6.4 Awareness of/contact with DEAs/PACTS *etc.*, by size and sector random sample (weighted)

Size (no of employees)	Aware of PACTs/DEAs % (of respondents in size group)	No. having contact with PACTs/DEAs as % of no. aware	Total (N= 100%)
11 to 24	46.9	30.4	701
25 to 49	47.2	24.8	299
50 to 99	55.0	36.4	140
100 to 199	66.2	53.3	68
200 plus	79.6	66.7	49
No. of respondents (=100%)	630	212	1,257
Sector			
Energy/water supply.	36.4	75.0	11
Metals/minerals	56.5	76.9	23
Engineering	54.4	28.6	90
Other manufacturing	39.8	43.6	98
Construction	37.3	36.0	67
Distribution/hotels	51.0	28.9	353
Transport/communication	47.7	19.4	65
Financial & business services	56.8	28.0	176
Other services	50.4	38.8	373
No. of respondents (=100%)	630	212	1,257

Source: IES Survey, 1994

employing disabled people increases with employer size, and subsequent Chapters have shown that attitudes, policies and practices towards people with disabilities vary in similar fashion with employer size).

As far as sectoral variation is concerned, it would seem that, in general terms, awareness of PACTs/DEAs tended to be higher among employers in the service sectors than in production sectors; but this higher level of awareness was not reflected in generally higher 'contact rates', which were, if anything, higher in some of the production sectors.

Respondents who claimed to have had contacts with PACTs/DEAs *etc.* were also asked to indicate what such contact had been about. The various reasons given by respondents are summarised in Table 6.5.

The range of reasons for contact with PACTs/DEAs is a wide one, but appears reasonably to correspond with the range of activities of those bodies. Some interesting differences exist

Table 6.5 Main reasons for employer contact with PACTs/DEAs *etc.*

Reason for contact with PACT/DEA *etc.*	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users sample%
General: 'to do with employing people with disabilities'	16.9	19.4
To get literature on employing people with disabilities	13.4	1.7
They come to talk to us about employing people with disabilities	12.0	13.1
Don't know	10.7	2.9
To find out whether firm had vacancy suitable for disabled employee	9.4	12.0
Requested assessment of disabled employees/routine assessment	8.7	5.7
To arrange special equipment/training for people with disabilities	6.0	18.9
To get information on benefits/help available for disabled person	4.9	12.0
'We employ them/are employed by them'	3.8	3.4
To obtain exemption from employing people with disabilities	3.4	0.0
To find out about employment rights of people with disabilities	2.8	9.7
To discuss the number of people with disabilities the firm employs	2.8	2.9
To get assistance in attracting applications from disabled people	2.2	4.0
To discuss why the quota had not been met	1.4	0.0
Info. on Symbol scheme	0.8	9.7
Wanted to develop stronger links with PACT	0.3	3.4
Info. on funding/grants available for people with disabilities	0.3	1.7
Other	0.0	3.4
No. of respondents (=100%)	212	175

Source: IES Survey, 1994

between the reasons given by Symbol users and those given by respondents from the random sample, however. In particular, it seems that Symbol users were considerably more likely to have contact with PACTs/DEAs with regard to special equipment for disabled employees, and for information on benefits for disabled people; and rather less likely than firms in general simply to have had contact through literature received from PACTs/DEAs.

Of some surprise, perhaps, is the very small proportion (ten per cent) of Symbol users who had had contact with PACTs/DEAs, who claim that such contact had been concerned with information relating to Symbol use itself (given the key official role for PACT teams in supporting Symbol users).

Those who had had contact with PACTs/DEAs were also asked how useful they had found the contact, and their responses are summarised in Table 6.6. It is clear from the table that the majority of those who had had such contact rated the experience as fairly useful or very useful, and this applied particularly to the Symbol users (some 94 per cent of whom felt that the contact had been useful, as compared with 82 per cent of respondents from the random sample).

Table 6.6 Perceived usefulness of employer contact with PACTs/DEAs *etc.*

How useful was contact?	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users sample %
Very useful	41.6	65.1
Fairly useful	39.9	29.1
Not very useful	14.9	5.7
Not useful	3.6	0.0
No. of respondents (=100%)	212	175

Source: IES Survey, 1994

There are few general messages from these findings regarding the market penetration and effectiveness of the PACTs/DEAs in their dealings with employers. It would appear that their market penetration is high (at least in comparison with other sources of advice/information and support), and that customer satisfaction is also relatively high. Arguably, penetration and satisfaction are higher among the larger, 'better practice' organisations (as represented by Symbol users), suggesting perhaps that more effort should be devoted to reaching and working with smaller firms whose needs in this area (as documented by this and previous research) are greater[1].

6.4 Employer use of Access to Work and Special Schemes

A further issue given some weight in the survey design, was the extent to which respondents had had contact with the Access to Work programme (AtW) (or its predecessor, Special Schemes), through which the Employment Service provides or subsidises assistance for the employment of disabled people (see Table 6.1). AtW is a relatively new (1994) programme, and it is not surprising that take-up (among the random sample at least) as reported in Table 6.1 was relatively low (with four per cent of respondents claiming some sort of contact with AtW). Furthermore, employers would not necessarily know whether any of their employees were in receipt of AtW. Some of the support provided is received directly by the individual concerned, and outside the workplace. Again, as shown in Table 6.2 above, awareness of the programme increases strongly with establishment size.

Respondents reporting contact with AtW were questioned about the nature of the support they had received (Table 6.7 sets out the responses to these questions).

[1] It should, of course, be noted that resource considerations and 'value for money' are also relevant here. A key question is how best to use resources to achieve the largest impact on employment. Fewer small firms may employ people with disabilities, but the larger number of small firms means that their overall impact on the workforce may be as high, or higher.

Table 6.7 Assistance/support received through Access to Work/Special Schemes

Type of support received	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users sample %
Payment for alteration to premises/equipment	14.3	23.2
Payment for special aids/equipment	27.6	18.8
Payment for communicators/interpreters for deaf people	5.8	10.1
Assistance with travel cost to/from work	15.1	13.0
Payments for adapted vehicles	3.3	0.0
Communicator service at interview	6.6	8.7
Payment for personal reader for blind employee	3.3	2.9
Payment for a support worker	5.0	4.3
Other (specified by respondent)		
General advice	*11.4*	*10.1*
Advice on disability	*1.3*	*4.3*
Funds and support (unspecified)	*2.2*	*4.3*
Other (unspecified)	*0.0*	*4.3*
Don't know	2.7	7.2
Not applicable – application still awaiting decision	0.9	1.4
Not applicable – application refused	0.0	0.0
None	41.0	18.8
No. of respondents (100%)	41	69

Source: IES Survey, 1994

Bearing in mind the relatively small numbers of respondents involved, the differences between the two samples are not marked; the most notable difference being that Symbol users were rather less likely than firms in general to have had contact with AtW/Special Schemes but not to have received any support from the scheme in question (19 per cent of Symbol users and 41 per cent of the random sample who had had contact with the initiative(s) had not received such support). The data do not, however, suggest that this was because the firms in the random sample were likely to have applied for such support and had it refused.

As far as the type of support received is concerned, three types of support predominated for both samples (Table 6.7 — the small number of respondents involved should be borne in mind when interpreting this table):

- payment for alterations to premises or equipment
- payment for special aids or equipment, and
- assistance with travel costs to/from work.

Table 6.8 Employer participation in local/national bodies/networks related to disability

	Random sample (weighted)		Symbol users sample	
Joined disability-related body?	%	% (of whole sample)	%	% (of whole sample)
Yes	19.8	1.5	45.8	15.1
No	80.2		54.2	
Total	100.0		100.0	
No. of respondents (=100%)	107	1,257	106	251

Source: IES Survey, 1994

6.5 Participation in employer disability networks

Respondents (see Table 6.1) indicating that they had had some contact either with the national Employers' Forum on Disability or with any Local Employer Networks (LENs)[1] providing advice, support *etc.* on disability issues, were questioned in more detail about the nature and extent of their involvement in such networks, and their views on the value of employer networking on disability issues.

Respondents were asked, first, whether their organisation or establishment had:

> *'. . . joined any local or national body or network in order to assist in the recruitment, employment or retention of people with disabilities.'*

Table 6.8 shows, not surprisingly, a greater propensity to join such bodies among the Symbol users than among employers in general. Thus not only were Symbol users more likely to have contact with networks (Table 6.1) but having had such contact they were more likely to join one; 46 per cent having taken such a step, compared with only 20 per cent of employers from the random sample who had had contact with such a body. This is consistent with the findings from the IES study on Local Employer Networks, which shows that membership of such networks tends to be dominated by larger, 'good practice' organisations.

Viewed from the perspective of the sample as a whole, however, it is clear that the coverage of such networks within the business community is very low to date (overall in the sample, only 15 per cent of Symbol users, and two per cent of firms in general claim to be members)[2], and there is considerable potential for

[1] A summary report of the various Local Employer Networks on disability (a separate IES study) is available from the Department for Education and Employment (Maginn and Meager, 1994).

[2] It should, of course, be recognised that very few local areas have such a network in existence.

Table 6.9 Employer participation in disability networks by establishment/organisation size

Size (No. of employees)	% in membership: Random sample (weighted)	Symbol users sample
1 to 24		11.1
11 to 24	0.7	
25 to 49	0.3	15.4
50 to 99	4.3	19.2
100 to 199	2.9	14.3
200 plus	10.2	15.1
All sizes	1.5	15.1
No. of respondents (=100%)	*1,257*	*251*

Source: IES Survey, 1994

expansion, particularly given that the 'conversion rate' from contact to membership would appear to be relatively high.

Table 6.9 breaks the membership data down by size of establishment (for the random sample) or organisation (for the Symbol users sample), and confirms that among employers in general, the likelihood of membership of a disability-related body increases strongly with size. Among the Symbol users there was no clear pattern, but this is not surprising since, by definition, Symbol users are likely to have a 'proactive' stance on disability issues, and small firms which are Symbol users may well be atypical of the small firm population as a whole.

Respondents claiming membership of such a body were then asked which organisation(s) they were a member of. Table 6.10 shows their responses (identifying the EFD and the six most well established English Networks[1], together with other organisations cited by the respondents themselves).

The table shows (although small numbers dictate caution in interpretation) that the national EFD dominates the employer networks and bodies on disability issues: of the six English local networks researched in the IES study, only the two largest and longer established ones (in Birmingham and Milton Keynes) were cited by respondents in the survey. A variety of other bodies were also cited, including one of the better-established Scottish networks, a relatively new Essex-based network, and a number of other disability organisations which are not themselves predominantly employer networks (including Remploy, local CEPDs and some voluntary organisations). Local authority networks were also cited by some respondents.

[1] Researched in the IES study on Local Employer Networks.

Table 6.10 Membership of specific national/local bodies on disability issues

Membership of:	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users sample %
Employers' Forum on Disability	48.3	34.2
Local Networks		
Sussex		
Hampshire		
Milton Keynes		2.6
Birmingham	1.0	
Thames Valley		
Calderdale and Kirklees		
Other bodies (respondent-defined)		
Mid-Essex Disability Group	1.0	2.6
Northern Employers Association on Disabilities	1.0	
Local authority networks	20.2	2.6
Lothian network	2.7	
MENCAP	2.4	
CEPD	6.0	10.5
Remploy		2.6
Other (unspecified)	7.5	39.5
Don't know	7.9	5.3
No. of respondents (=100%)	19	38

Source: IES Survey, 1994

Respondents citing specific organisations of which they were members were asked whether these organisations were solely disability-related or whether they were also concerned with broader (equal opportunities) issues. Among the 24 respondents to this question from the Symbol users sample and the ten respondents from the random sample, just over half in both cases said the organisations had a specific disability focus; the remainder had a broader remit.

Members were asked how useful membership of the body in question had been to them, and their responses are shown in Table 6.11. The table suggests that the existing networks and bodies were generally well-regarded by the (albeit small number of) members in the sample, although there was a minority of sceptics among the random sample members.

Table 6.12 looks at the reasons given for not joining a disability network/body, by those respondents who had had contact with such an organisation, but decided not to join.

Table 6.11 Perceived usefulness of employer membership of disability networks/bodies

How useful has membership been?	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users sample %
Very useful	36.2	47.4
Fairly useful	41.8	47.4
Not very useful	5.0	2.6
Not at all useful	17.0	2.6
No. of respondents (=100%)	19	38

Source: IES Survey, 1994

The results suggest that, for both samples, the main reason for not joining such a body was that the employers in question had no perceived need for their own organisation which they felt such a body would help to meet. Non-participation does not, on the basis of these responses, appear primarily to reflect an overall scepticism about the value of such networks in general, or concerns about the cost of membership or its potential demands on managerial or staff time (although the latter two factors appear to be slightly more important to the predominantly small establishments in the random sample than to Symbol users).

All employers in the sample (with the exception of the small number which had already joined such a body) were then asked:

Table 6.12 Reasons given for not joining employer-based network/body on disability issues

Why not joined?	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users sample %
No perceived need for help on employment of people with disabilities	61.6	51.1
Head office issue	13.0	4.4
No management/staff time to spare for network membership	5.6	0.0
Never asked to	5.4	13.3
Cost	4.0	2.2
Never thought of it	3.2	0.0
Didn't know existed	1.9	4.4
None in the area	1.2	6.7
Sceptical of the effectiveness of such bodies	0.9	4.4
Currently looking at it	0.7	6.7
Have other sources of information/support	0.0	4.4
Don't know	6.4	4.4
No. of respondents (=100%)	75	38

Source: IES Survey, 1994

Table 6.13 Perceived potential usefulness of local employer-led body on disability issues

How useful?	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users sample %
Very useful	12.1	20.2
Fairly useful	43.3	46.5
Not very useful	31.5	27.2
Not at all useful	13.0	6.1
No. of respondents (=100%)	1,238	213

Source: IES Survey, 1994

> *'Would you find a local employer-led body to help and inform you on the recruitment, employment and retention of people with disabilities useful?'*

and their responses are summarised in Table 6.13.

The results suggest considerable potential interest in such networks among respondents, with over half of the random sample and two thirds of the Symbol users saying that they would find such a body fairly or very useful. As might be expected, scepticism was somewhat higher among the random sample (where 13 per cent felt that such a local body would be 'not at all useful', compared with only six per cent of Symbol users).

Given the under-representation of small firms in local employer networks, and the discussion (see Maginn and Meager *op. cit.*) about the extent to which such networks could offer a service of relevance to small firms, it is clearly relevant to examine whether there was any variation by firm size in the perceived potential of network membership. Table 6.14 does this for the random sample.

There was, as expected, a fairly clear relationship with size, but the variation between the smallest firms and the largest ones is not large (only some 13 percentage points), and the table shows that, even among the smallest establishments, over half of the

Table 6.14 Perceived usefulness of local networks by establishment size

Size: no. of employees	local networks would be very or fairly useful %	No. of respondents
11 to 24	52.5	696
25 to 49	57.2	297
50 to 99	59.5	134
100 to 199	63.2	66
200 plus	65.7	44
All respondents (=100%)	55.4	1,238

Source: IES Survey 1994

Table 6.15 Why would local employer-led body on disability issues not be useful?

Reason	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users sample %
No perceived need for help	73.8	62.0
No management/staff time to spare for network membership	4.0	2.8
Sceptical of effectiveness of such bodies	4.1	18.3
Cost	0.0	1.4
Don't employ any people with disabilities	3.7	1.4
Have other sources of information/help	4.0	8.5
Issue for Head Office to decide	4.0	0.0
Can find the information ourselves	0.7	4.2
Our jobs are unsuitable for people with disabilities	5.1	1.4
No vacancies/recruitment at present	2.9	2.8
No discrimination against disabled people	1.8	0.0
Other reasons (unspecified)	0.3	1.4
Don't know	2.0	0.0
No. of respondents (=100%)	549	71

Source: IES Survey, 1994

respondents would regard local employer networks as having a potentially useful function. This suggests that there may, in practice, be considerable potential for the networks (if they can devise appropriate membership conditions and services for this group) to expand small firm membership.

Those stating that they would not find such a body useful, were then asked why not (see Table 6.15).

The table confirms that for both samples, lack of interest in such local bodies was predominantly due to a perception that the organisation itself had no need for the services of such a body. Interestingly, among the (presumably better-informed) sample of Symbol users there was a minority (18 per cent) who are more generally sceptical of the effectiveness of such bodies. Again concern about the managerial time or cost involved did not seem to be a major issue. Symbol users were somewhat more likely to believe that they have other sources (internal or external) of the kinds of information/support which such a network might supply. Firms from the random sample also appeared to be more likely to explain their own lack of interest in terms of not having any disabled employees, or believing that their own jobs were unsuitable for people with disabilities, or even that discrimination against people with disabilities in employment was not an issue.

Finally, respondents who stated (Table 6.13) that they would find such a local body useful, were asked what they would expect a local network to do. Table 6.16 summarises their responses.

Table 6.16 What should a local employer network on disability do?

Suggested activities	Random sample (weighted) %	Symbol users sample %
Give general info./advice on employing disabled people	51.3	36.6
Act as source of suitable disabled applicants for employment	14.1	19.0
Provide advice on types of jobs suitable for disabled people	10.7	7.0
Provide advice on problems involved in employing disabled people	7.3	7.0
Provide advice on legal requirements involved in employing disabled people/advice on health and safety issues	6.8	4.2
Advice on grants/benefits available for employers who employ people with disabilities	5.8	5.6
Provide advice on adaptation of premises/equipment etc.	5.0	7.0
Don't know	4.9	8.5
Advice on where to obtain special equipment/how to adapt premises/ what facilities would be needed	4.7	1.4
Provide forum for exchange of ideas on employing disabled people	3.5	12.0
Provide training/counselling/work experience on disability issues	2.8	4.2
Disseminate good practice	2.3	7.0
Help in assessing costs of employing people with disabilities	2.1	0.0
Advice on what to do if existing employee became disabled	2.0	2.8
Provide case-histories and up-to-date information	1.9	9.2
Nothing/unlikely to need a network or such a contact/prefer other organisations for this	0.7	3.5
Other (unspecified)	0.0	0.7
No. of respondents (=100%)	683	142

Source: IES Survey, 1994

The responses show that for over half of the respondents in the random sample, the main interest was in such an organisation as a source of general advice and information on disability issues. Whilst this was also the view of just over a third of Symbol users it is clear that a higher proportion of these had more specific ideas about what they would expect such a network to do (they had, for example, a greater interest in a network as a mechanism for exchanging ideas or disseminating good practice or publicising case-histories).

For the most part, the activities cited correspond well to what such local networks currently do (see recent IES research on this[1]). Among both samples, however, the specific activity mentioned most often as desirable, was for the network to play a role as a conduit for suitable disabled applicants for employment (14 per cent of the random sample respondents; and 19 per cent of Symbol users mentioned this).

[1] Maginn and Meager *op. cit.*

This interest corresponds with the well-documented concern of employers that even when they have pro-active policies on disability, it is difficult to attract suitable disabled recruits, and that the existing (voluntary and public sector) mechanisms are perceived to be ill-co-ordinated and ineffective in this respect. It contrasts somewhat, however, with the apparent reluctance of most of the existing local employer networks (see Maginn and Meager *op. cit.*) to get involved in 'employment agency' activity (and most of them have taken an explicit decision not to do this), but to concentrate on information/awareness-raising type activities. The findings above suggest, however, that there may be a non-trivial level of demand for such services, albeit among a minority of employers. The fact that this demand appears to be greater among the better-informed Symbol users, moreover, suggests further that any initial success by networks in awareness-raising on disability issues in the employer community may well generate a subsequent demand for such recruitment activity.

6.6 Summary

- Respondents in the Symbol users sample showed a considerably higher level of awareness of each source of advice and support than respondents in the random sample. They were also more likely to have made some use of each source.
- Amongst the random sample, awareness of TECs was greater than awareness of any other source. However, TECs were the only source discussed which was not disability-specific, and this greater awareness was likely to be through contact over issues other than disability.
- Respondents who were aware of or had had contact with PACTs/DEAs were more likely to employ some disabled people than those who were not. Employers had contacted PACTs/DEAs for a wide range of reasons, and these generally corresponded to the range of activities of these bodies. Symbol users were more likely to have had contact for specific advice or information. They were less likely than employers in general simply to have had contact through literature. The majority found contact with PACTs/DEAs fairly or very useful.
- Take-up of Access to Work (a new programme at the time of the survey) was relatively rare amongst respondents. The main types of support received were: payment for alterations to premises or equipment; payment for special aids or equipment; and assistance with travel costs to/from work. Some of this support is provided directly to the individual concerned, and employers may not be aware of the extent of use amongst their employees.

- Symbol users were more likely than respondents in the random sample to have had contact with employer networks and, having had contact, more likely to join. Coverage of these networks was low at the time of the survey, but there was evidence of potential for expansion. A high proportion of employers having contact became members, and members were generally positive about their membership.
- The main reason for not belonging to a network was the lack of any perceived need for the type of support provided. Respondents interested in joining a network were asked what they would expect one to do. Their views generally corresponded with the activities of these networks, acting as a general source of advice and information. However, there was also demand for networks to act as a conduit for suitable disabled applicant for employment. This interest corresponds with the concern of employers that, even when they have proactive policies on disability, they have difficulty in attracting applicants.

7. Symbol Users

This chapter explores the extent to which respondents were aware of the existence of the Symbol and had signed up to its use. Previous chapters illustrated how attitudes towards the employment of people with disabilities and the practices adopted varied between the two samples. This chapter takes the analysis further, and also includes some additional information about Symbol use.

7.1 Summary of earlier findings about Symbol users

The previous chapters have included a number of analyses of differences between the policies and practices of organisations in the Symbol users sample and those in the random sample. Symbol users were more likely to employ people with disabilities and to employ larger numbers of people with disabilities. This difference persists when the size of each employing unit is taken into account.

Symbol users were more likely than establishments in the random sample to have adopted a range of positive policies and practices towards the employment of people with disabilities. For example, 41 per cent of organisations in the Symbol users sample were reported to have a written policy relating to the employment of people with disabilities. Furthermore, it appears that these policies were broader in coverage than those adopted by establishments in the random sample.

Chapter 3 explored actions on three of the commitments made by Symbol users: interviewing all applicants meeting the minimum criteria for a job; consulting disabled employees; and retaining in employment employees who become disabled. The majority of both samples (96 per cent) reported interviewing all applicants with a disability who met the minimum criteria for a job vacancy. Symbol users were, however, more likely to be consulting disabled employees and to be prepared to retain existing employees who became disabled. Twenty-eight per cent of Symbol users consulted disabled employees on a formal basis; 46 per cent on an informal basis and a quarter did not consult at all. This compared to eight, 50 and 42 per cent of the random sample respectively. Ninety per cent of Symbol users were prepared to take positive steps to retain existing employees who become disabled, compared with 78 per cent of the random

sample. The data suggest that Symbol users were prepared to take a wider range of actions to retain such employees.

The majority of respondents (in both samples) not employing any people with disabilities at the time of the survey reported that this was because no one with a disability had applied. In general, members of the Symbol users sample were more likely to be proactive in seeking applications from people with disabilities, and to find it slightly easier to attract applicants, than establishments in the random sample.

Chapter 4 explored the perceived ease of employing people with different disabilities and the perceived barriers to their employment. In general, Symbol users were much more likely to see it as possible to employ people with the disabilities listed than were members of the random sample.

Chapter 5 explored respondents' willingness to make accommodation for disabled employees. Ninety-four per cent of Symbol users were prepared to make costless changes to working practices; 97 per cent to make minor changes to the working environment; and 85 per cent to pay the cost of adaptations necessary. Members of the random sample were less willing to make and pay for such accommodations. However, over two thirds were apparently willing to pay for any necessary changes.

The data presented in earlier chapters clearly illustrate that members of the Symbol users sample were more proactive in their policies and practices towards the employment of people with disabilities than employers in general. This chapter takes the analysis further.

7.2 Awareness and extent of use

7.2.1 Overall levels of awareness and use

The Symbol users sample was drawn from records of organisations registered as being signed up to the Symbol. Nevertheless, not all respondents in this group reported even being aware of it. Eighty-nine per cent were aware of the Symbol, and 85.3 per cent of these reported that their organisation was signed up to its use. A further 4.5 per cent were reported to be working towards signing up (Table 7.1, below). Overall, 76 per cent of the Symbol users sample were reported to be signed up to the symbol, and a further four per cent were working towards this.

The extent of knowledge and use of the Symbol amongst the random sample was much lower. Slightly over a fifth of respondents were aware of its existence and almost a quarter of these reported that the establishment (or rather the organisation of which it was a part) was signed up to or working towards its

Table 7.1 Awareness and use of the Symbol

	Random sample (weighted)	Symbol users
Percentage aware of Symbol	22.4	89.2
N=100%	1,257	251
Of those aware of Symbol:		
Signed up	14.0	85.3
Working towards	9.2	4.5
Not signed up or working towards	69.8	8.5
Don't know	6.9	1.8
N=100%	282	224

Source: IES Survey, 1994

use. Overall, three per cent of establishments in the random sample had signed up to the Symbol. However, our data are likely to underestimate the extent of knowledge and use of the Symbol amongst establishments in the random sample. As noted above, not all respondents from organisations known to be Symbol users were aware of this.

The analysis already presented in this report has been conducted separately for each sample. On many measures of policy and behaviour, differences have appeared between the two samples. Some of these differences are attributable to the different unit on which they are based (the establishment or organisation) or to the larger average size of the Symbol-using respondents. Members of the Symbol users sample are generally considered to be 'good practice' organisations in the employment of people with disabilities. This is generally evident throughout the analysis. Later in this chapter some of the information presented earlier is drawn on to compare those organisations or establishments which were reported to be Symbol users with those which were not. This emphasises further differences in practices between users and non-users.

7.2.2 The relationship to size and sector

Awareness of the Symbol was related to establishment size in the *random sample*. Respondents in the smallest establishments were least likely to have heard of it — 18.1 per cent of those with 11 to 24 employees. Respondents in a fifth of establishments with 25 to 49 employees, and a quarter of those with 50 to 99 employees were aware of the Symbol, compared with slightly over a third (38.3 per cent) of those with 100 to 199 employees and over half (57.8 per cent) of those with more than 200 employees.

There was also a relationship between establishment size and the likelihood of being signed up to the symbol. Only 1.4 per cent of establishments with 11 to 24 employees were Symbol

users compared to 14.7 per cent of those with 200 or more employees. Most of these establishments belonged to larger organisations. Small organisations, particularly those with only one site, are less likely to have the resources to devote to finding out about or becoming involved in initiatives of any kind. They offer fewer vacancies, and often a smaller range of job types than larger organisations and therefore have possibly less potential for offering regular opportunities for people with some types of disability. Some conditions are 'disabling' only at certain levels of severity and largely go unnoticed. It is possible that a more detailed investigation would find that small employers do employ a greater proportion than is generally assumed, of people with less obvious disabilities.

Amongst Symbol users there was no clear relation between organisational size and either awareness of the Symbol or Symbol use. Respondents in the 25 to 49 band were least aware (65.4 per cent) of its existence and least likely to be signed up to its use (even when the extent of awareness is controlled for).

Similar distinctions between the two samples emerge when the relationship with industrial sector is considered. Amongst the random sample (Table 7.2) respondents in the energy, transport, financial and other services sectors were most likely to be aware of the Symbol. This is not directly comparable with either the patterns of the existence of a policy or the employment of people with disabilities (see Chapters 2 and 3). Such a variation in relationships has been commented on before. The lack of action in one area does not necessarily imply a lack in another. Even when the extent of awareness of the Symbol is taken into account, establishments in sectors with the highest levels of awareness were most likely to have signed up to its use (Table 7.2).

Table 7.2 Awareness of the Symbol and industrial sector, random sample (weighted)

Industrial sector	Percentage aware of Symbol	Total (N=100%)	Percentage signed up to Symbol	Total (N=100%)
Energy/water supply	28.3	11	31.5	3
Metals/minerals	12.2	23	–	3
Engineering	17.6	90	1.2	16
Other manufacturing	19.8	98	2.2	19
Construction	18.2	67	–	12
Distribution/hotels	19.6	353	6.7	69
Transport/communications	27.5	65	5.7	18
Financial & business services	28.5	176	26.7	50
Other services	24.4	373	20.7	91
No. of respondents	22.4	1,257	14.0	282

Source: IES Survey, 1994

Table 7.3 Length of time signed up to Symbol use (per cent)

	Random sample (weighted)	Symbol users
Less than 3 months	6.6	5.8
3 to 6 months	11.4	7.9
6 months to 1 year	5.7	24.6
1 to 2 years	15.4	21.5
2 to 3 years	16.7	17.8
More than 3 years	44.1	22.5
No. of respondents (=100%)	40	191

Source: IES Survey, 1994

There was very little difference between industrial sectors in either awareness or use of the Symbol within the Symbol users sample.

7.2.3 How long have they been Symbol users?

Table 7.3 shows the length of time members of each sample had been signed up to Symbol use.

The number of Symbol users in the random sample is small and the figures have to be treated with care. The main point to emphasise is that the majority had been Symbol users for several years. There was more variation amongst members of the Symbol users sample. Just over a third had been Symbol users for under a year and 40 per cent for more than two years. The long term use amongst both samples might help to explain the nature of responses to some of the questions reported below.

7.3 Reasons for not being signed up to Symbol use

Table 7.4 lists the reasons given for not signing up to its use by respondents in the random sample who were aware of the Symbol. Only 23 of the Symbol users sample were reported not to have signed up to its use, and their reasons for not doing so are too thinly spread for percentages to be meaningful. Four reported that they were currently looking into Symbol use.

Almost a fifth of the random sample reported that they had no need, or that the need had not arisen to become involved with the Symbol. This might suggest that they already had all the information, *etc.* they needed to employ people with disabilities but it is more likely that they could see no possibility or need to employ these groups. Around 14 per cent reported that the decision was a head office issue, and 13 per cent reported that they did not have enough information. A range of other reasons was mentioned, as listed in Table 7.4.

Table 7.4 Reasons for not signing up to the symbol, random sample (weighted)

	% mentioning each reason
No need/need has not arisen	20.1
Don't know	15.0
Head Office deals with this issue	13.9
Don't have enough information about it	12.9
No particular reason	7.5
Have never thought about it	6.7
Job/industry not suitable to employment of people with disabilities	6.5
Not enough time/not a priority	5.8
Not their responsibility	3.8
Haven't been approached	2.8
Don't approve/actions speak louder than words	2.5
Would not be able to fulfil criteria	2.3
Looking into it	2.3
No. of respondents (=100%)	215

Source: IES Survey 1994

The reasons for not being involved with the Symbol fall into a number of categories. Some relate specifically to the Symbol, including the extent to which information about it is easily available, and the requirements of commitment. Others relate more generally to attitudes towards the employment of people with disabilities. The general lack of awareness of the Symbol's existence amongst respondents in the random sample suggests that information and publicity is a key issue. However, a lack of perception of the possibilities of employing people with disabilities also plays a role. Very few respondents reported that they would not be able to meet the commitments or that they did not approve of the Symbol.

7.4 Reasons for making the commitment

Forty members of the random sample (*ie* three per cent of the total) were Symbol users and a fifth of these did not know why the commitment had been made. Since it is often at the level of the organisation rather than the establishment that a commitment is made, this is hardly surprising. The small numbers do, however, mean that the responses from the random sample have to be interpreted with care.

The most common reason for signing up to Symbol use was a commitment to equal opportunities in general or to the employment of people with disabilities in particular (Table 7.5). Approximately a third of users in each sample gave this as a

Table 7.5 Reasons for making the commitment (per cent)

	Random sample (weighted)	Symbol users
To promote equal opportunities/feel strongly about employing people with disabilities	35.0	30.9
To attract applications from people with disabilities	5.6	20.9
Already employ disabled people/already meet the criteria required, no reason not to sign up	7.8	19.4
Wanted to make a public statement about employment of people with disabilities	13.0	13.6
Approached by disabled group/outside pressure and influences	7.1	11.0
Thought it a good idea	1.8	8.9
Don't know	21.6	4.2
To improve company image/make company look good	13.0	1.6
Other	5.3	1.6
Financial help	–	0.5
No. of respondents (=100%)	40	191

Source: IES Survey, 1994

reason. A further 13 to 14 per cent reported wanting to make a public statement about the employment of people with disabilities. A fifth of the Symbol users sample were reported to already meet the criteria, there being no reason, as a result, not to sign up to the Symbol.

Amongst Symbol users there was a strong commitment to equal opportunities and the employment of people with disabilities prompting a commitment to the Symbol. The Symbol was acting both as a 'badge' to existing good practice, and in promoting good practice. It is not easy to assess the exact balance between these two roles but, at this point in time, it appears that its larger role was as a mark of existing good practice. This role should be regarded as positive. Some mechanism is needed to highlight good practice and bring the relevant activities into a coherent whole. The anticipated practical assistance of Symbol use is indicated in the extent to which respondents felt it would help attract disabled applicants. Earlier chapters have shown this to be the main difficulty employers report in employing people with disabilities. Overcoming perceptions and prejudices against the employment of people with disabilities takes time, and it is only through example that significant progress is likely.

7.5 Practices associated with Symbol use

Earlier chapters explored various policies and practices around the employment of people with disabilities. Differences emerged between the two samples, many of which were not unexpected. This analysis can now be taken further.

The sample of Symbol users was drawn from the Employment Service register of committed companies. Twenty per cent of respondents reported that they were either not aware of the Symbol, or not signed up, or working towards, its use (*ie* they appear to be 'non-users'). However, virtually all the organisations in this sample must be Symbol users or they would not have appeared on the register. Earlier chapters have shown that the adoption of policies and practices sympathetic to the employment of people with disabilities was more widespread amongst Symbol users than in the random sample. Making a distinction between 'Symbol usersand 'non-users' within the Symbol users sample is therefore not useful[1].

The fact that a proportion of respondents in the Symbol users sample were not aware of the Symbol or its adoption is probably of more interest than the patterns revealed by any further analysis comparing the 'users' and 'non-users'. Interviews were conducted with the person in charge of recruitment and/or recruitment policy. This was typically the personnel officer, equal opportunities officer or, in the case of smaller organisations, the managing director. If there is some vagueness or misunderstanding about an organisation's Symbol use amongst people in these positions, it does not bode well for its use elsewhere in the organisation.

The random sample was drawn to be representative of the population of establishments. It is possible that some of these were part of one of the organisations interviewed as a Symbol user. This random sample provides information on the extent of Symbol use across establishments. It does not necessarily tell us the proportion of establishments which belong to organisations signed up to the Symbol. It does, however, indicate the distribution of establishments in which it is *known* that the organisation of which it is a part is a Symbol user.

The rest of this section explores some policies and practices associated with Symbol use. First, some comparisons are made between Symbol users and non-users in the random sample. It must be remembered that only 40 establishments in the random sample were Symbol users. The data must therefore be treated with care. However, all the patterns point in the same direction and add weight to each other. Symbol-using establishments were reported to be more sympathetic towards the employment of people with disabilities. We then go on to discuss some practices specifically related to Symbol use: monitoring; contact with a PACT or MODU; and the use of the Symbol sign.

---

[1] Comparisons of the practices of 'users' and 'non-users' within the Symbol users sample show little difference between the actions taken by each, for example, in the employment, recruitment, retention and accommodation of people with disabilities.

Table 7.6 Symbol use and the employment of people with disabilities and the existence of a policy, random sample (weighted) (per cent)

	Symbol user	Non-Symbol user
Had disabled employees	56.2	41.5
No disabled employees	23.7	55.7
Don't know	20.1	2.8
Written policy	44.5	10.1
Unwritten policy	0.5	5.4
General equal opportunities policy	49.9	48.0
No policy	5.1	34.6
No. of respondents (=100%)	40	1,198

Source: IES Survey, 1994

7.5.1 Policies, practices and the employment of people with disabilities — random sample

Those establishments in the *random sample* reported to be signed up to Symbol use were only slightly more likely to have some disabled employees than those who were not (Table 7.6). There was therefore a significant amount of employment of disabled employees outside those establishments which are considered to be 'good practice'. Some of these will simply have decided it is not worth signing up to Symbol use. However, as is evident from this report, it is not just the 'good practice' employers who are operating in a positive manner. It is possible, however, that the good practice employers act in a more coherent and structured manner.

The existence of a policy, especially one specifically addressing the employment of people with disabilities was more strongly related to Symbol use (Table 7.6). Just over a third of non-Symbol users did not have any type of policy compared with 5.1 per cent of Symbol users. There was very little difference in the incidence of general equal opportunities policies.

Chapter 4 discussed the attitudes towards employing people with different disabilities. Respondents in the Symbol users sample were generally more favourable towards the employment of people with all types of disability. When the random sample is subdivided into Symbol users and non-users these differences in attitude emerge again (Table 7.7). To simplify the data, only the percentage in which it was reported impossible to employ people with each disability is reported. The Symbol user establishments were considerably more likely to be able to provide employment for each type of disability.

Symbol users were more likely to be actively trying to attract applications from people with disabilities. Only 8.3 per cent of

Table 7.7 Percentages reporting it not possible to offer employment to people with each type of disability, random sample (weighted) (per cent)

	Symbol users	Non-Symbol users
Disability affecting mobility	3.2	27.4
Difficulty in seeing	19.0	52.9
Difficulty in hearing	1.6	14.7
Epilepsy	–	11.7
Mental handicap/learning difficulties	15.8	31.5
Depression/nervous and mental disorders	0.9	23.7
Heart, circulation, chest and breathing problems	2.8	14.0
Allergies and skin conditions	2.3	11.3
Diabetes	–	0.1

Note: Row percentages: N = 40 for Symbol users and 1,198 for non-users.

Source: IES Survey, 1994

non-Symbol users were actively trying to attract applications, compared with almost two-thirds of Symbol users. Overall the data suggest that many non-Symbol users in this sample either do not see the need or possibility to employ people with disabilities, or they do so without seeing any need to take any special action.

One of the commitments made by Symbol users is to consult regularly with disabled employees. Symbol users were more likely to be conducting some form of consultation (Table 7.8). Nevertheless, a significant minority did not appear to be doing so. Although non-Symbol users were less likely to consult their disabled employees, over half were doing so.

7.5.2 Monitoring Symbol use

A third (32.9 per cent) of Symbol users in the random sample were reported to be monitoring Symbol use, compared to over half (53.9 per cent) in the Symbol users sample. The relationship with establishment/organisational size is not very strong,

Table 7.8 Symbol use and consultation with disabled employees, random sample (weighted) Note: only asked of those with some disabled employees

	Symbol users	Non-Symbol users
Formal consultation	23.1	6.2
Informal consultation	60.5	49.5
No consultation	16.3	44.3
No. of respondents (=100%)	22	497

Source: IES Survey, 1994

Table 7.9 Methods of monitoring (per cent)

	Random sample (weighted)	Symbol users
Analysis of data on disabled people in the recruitment process	76.4	71.8
Monitoring progress of disabled within the organisation	46.0	32.0
Monitoring use of commitments	25.1	29.1
Head Office deals with it	4.9	–
Will do	1.4	1.9
Other	2.9	3.0
Don't know	4.0	1.0
No. of respondents (=100%)	13	103

Source: IES Survey, 1994

although the incidence of monitoring tends to increase with size. This reported lack of monitoring is perhaps a matter for concern. One of the commitments of Symbol use is to review these commitments, using the information to plan ahead. It seems appropriate to assume that some sort of monitoring would form part of this.

The most frequently used method of monitoring Symbol use was the analysis of data on disabled people and the recruitment process (Table 7. 9). Only about a quarter of Symbol users in each sample who were monitoring its use were reported to be specifically monitoring the use of the commitments.

7.5.3 Contact with PACT or MODU

To become a Symbol user employers have to contact either a PACT or MODU. Respondents were asked:

> *Did you receive any help/support/advice from PACT or MODU in becoming a symbol user and implementing the symbol commitments?*

A third of the Symbol users sample and 18.8 per cent of the random sample claimed not to have had any contact. Not too much weight should, however, be placed on this seeming lack of accordance with procedure. Many Symbol users had been signed up to its use for several years. The respondent may have forgotten the process through which they had achieved the status of Symbol user. It is also possible that someone else was responsible at that time and the respondent to this survey did not know whether or not a PACT or MODU were involved. The high proportion in the random sample reporting that they had 'just been told to use it (*ie* the Symbol) is not unexpected. Many will be part of a larger organisation and the head office would have been responsible for seeing through achievement of Symbol status.

Table 7.10 The usefulness and types of support received from PACTs/MODU, Symbol users sample only

	% reporting each category
Usefulness of support received	
Very useful	64.5
Fairly useful	31.8
Not very useful	3.7
Type of support received	
Advice on specific issues	73.8
Follow-up contact	35.5
Help with review	23.4
Information pack/literature	8.4
Seminars/employees/manager awareness	7.5
Funding	3.7
No. of respondents (=100%)	107

Source: IES Survey, 1994

The support received by Symbol users from PACTs and MODU was viewed favourably. Almost two-thirds reported that the support they received was very useful (Table 7.10). Only 3.7 per cent felt that the support had not been very useful.

Most of the support provided by PACTs and MODU took the form of advice on specific issues of concern to the employer (Table 7.10). Almost a quarter of Symbol users were reported to have received help with the review. Slightly over a third were reported to have received a follow-up contact.

7.5.4 Where the symbol is used

The Symbol is supposed to be used only on literature relating to recruitment, training and employment. To explore whether this is in fact the case, and the range of items on which the Symbol is used, respondents were asked an un-prompted, open-ended question. A small minority were using the Symbol in places they should not have been (Table 7.11), for example, product marketing material.

The Symbol was most frequently used in job advertisements, particularly those external to the organisation (slightly over 80 per cent of users in each sample). About a half in each sample were also using it for internal adverts. The next most frequently mentioned items were stationery and general information about the company.

From this it appears that most of the emphasis was on external recruitment, and this fits with the extent to which a lack of

Table 7.11 Where the Symbol is used (per cent)

	Random sample	Symbol users
Press and other advertisements for vacancies	82.4	84.3
Internal job advertisements	51.7	45.5
Application forms	44.0	36.6
Stationery items	25.5	28.3
General literature about the company	34.3	17.8
Nowhere	2.9	9.9
Personnel manuals	10.8	8.4
Staff newsletter	8.1	8.4
Training-related items	9.5	7.9
Product marketing material	6.9	5.2
Departmental reports	0.5	3.1
Don't know	1.6	0.5
No. of respondents (=100%)	40	191

Source: IES Survey, 1994

applications from people with disabilities was reported to account for the relatively low levels of recruitment, and hence employment, of people with disabilities. (Table 2.4 in Chapter 2 showed that over 80 per cent of respondents with no disabled employees reported a lack of disabled job applicants.) The importance of being seen as a good employer was emphasised when the reasons for becoming a Symbol user were explored. Its use on stationery items and general literature about the company would seem to fit with this. It was only a minority of companies who used the Symbol on personnel and training literature within the organisation beyond the recruitment process.

7.6 Does being a Symbol user make a difference?

Over 40 per cent of Symbol users in both samples reported that being a Symbol user had not made any difference (Table 7.12). Although this is perhaps discouraging, it should not be totally unexpected. It was suggested above that many employers use the Symbol as a 'badge' of existing good practice. They may have been adopting positive practices in the employment of people with disabilities for some time prior to becoming a Symbol user. Signing up to its use might have come after the main effects had been felt. This does not devalue the Symbol.

Respondents in the Symbol users sample were more likely to report that Symbol use had made a difference (44 per cent), compared with those in the random sample (27 per cent). However, almost a quarter of respondents in the random sample reported that they did not know whether being a Symbol user had

Table 7.12 Whether Symbol use makes a difference (per cent)

	Random sample (weighted)	Symbol users
Makes a difference	26.6	44.0
Too early to say	2.7	5.8
Makes no difference	47.1	43.5
Don't know	23.6	6.8
No. of respondents (=100%)	40	191

Source: IES Survey, 1994

made any difference. This may reflect a low level of dissemination about Symbol use and its impact within some organisations. However, the random sample was of establishments (rather than organisations) and our respondents may not have felt qualified to make a judgement, or possibly not have noted any particular impact on their establishment, not knowing about any wider impacts on the organisation of which they were a part.

The number of Symbol users in the random sample was small (40) and any further breakdown of the data in Table 7.12 should be treated with caution, although it did appear that respondents from the smallest establishments were more likely to report that Symbol use had made no difference, or that they did not know. Higher proportions of respondents from establishments with over 100 employees reported that Symbol use had made a difference.

The larger number of respondents in the Symbol users sample enables a clearer relationship to be seen. Symbol use was more likely to be making a difference within the larger organisations. Around a half of respondents from organisations with 100 or more employees reported that Symbol use had made a difference, compared with a third from the smallest organisations (Table 7.13). The 25 to 49 employee size band creates a slight discontinuity in the pattern, but the number of organisations in this category is particularly small.

Table 7.13 Whether Symbol use makes a difference, by size of organisation, Symbol users sample (per cent)

	Organisational size					
	Up to 24	25-49	50-99	100-199	200 +	All
Makes a difference	31.8	15.4	31.6	52.2	49.0	43.0
Too early to say	–	–	10.5	–	8.8	6.1
Makes no difference	63.6	84.6	47.4	43.5	34.3	44.1
Don't know	4.5	–	10.8	4.3	7.8	6.7
No. of respondents (=100%)	22	13	19	23	102	179

Source: IES Survey, 1994

Table 7.14 What difference has being a Symbol user made? (per cent)

	Random sample (weighted)	Symbol users
None	47.1	43.5
Attracted (more) applications from people with disabilities	12.0	14.1
Raised awareness of disabilities amongst other employees	10.2	14.1
Revised our recruitment/equal opportunities policies	2.9	4.2
People see us differently/they are more aware of our positive attitude towards the employment of people with disabilities	2.7	15.2
Too early to say	2.7	5.8
Increased costs – ads, paperwork etc.	–	1.0
Other	–	1.0
Don't know	24.1	6.8
No. of respondents (=100%)	40	191

Source: IES Survey, 1994

The differences that being a Symbol user has made reflect some of the themes discussed earlier (see Table 7.14). Use of the Symbol was seen as attracting more disabled applicants and enhancing the image of an employer. The reported difficulties in attracting applications from people with disabilities have been referred to several times in this report.

7.7 Difficulties experienced and changes desired

7.7.1 Problems experienced

Very few problems were reported to be arising out of Symbol use. Only one Symbol user in the random sample and 15 (eight per cent) amongst the Symbol users reported any.

Respondents were asked an open-ended, un-prompted question to explore the types of problem encountered. A list of anticipated problems was compiled in conjunction with the Employment Service and any responses were coded using this. Most of the anticipated problems were reported only by three or fewer respondents. These were: too many applications in general (can not sift to find people with disabilities); too many people with disabilities apply; no disabled applicants; Symbol use conflicts with equal opportunities policy; difficult to change selection process. Four respondents reported that it was not always possible to tell if applicants were disabled. The most frequently mentioned problem was the difficulty of ensuring every part of the organisation followed the commitments. This was reported by seven respondents.

7.7.2 Changes desired

Just over a fifth (42) of those signed up to Symbol use in the Symbol users sample and six per cent in the random sample (16) reported that they would like to see some changes made in the Symbol itself or in the commitments associated with it.

The majority of changes desired related to publicity and awareness. Twelve respondents reported that there should be more publicity and advertising. Eleven wanted the Symbol sign to be changed in some way. They wanted it to made brighter, more prominent, to stand out more or be a different colour.

A smaller number wanted changes made in the use and monitoring of the Symbol. Eight respondents wanted there to be more practical commitment made to the Symbol. Seven respondents wanted more government monitoring and checking of Symbol users, and enforcement of the commitments.

7.8 Summary

Earlier chapters illustrated a more positive and proactive approach towards people with disabilities amongst Symbol users. Nevertheless, a minority did not appear to be keeping to the commitments they made to become Symbol users. The analysis presented in this chapter provides further information on Symbol use. Some of the main findings are listed below:

- Eleven per cent of respondents in the Symbol users sample reported that they were not aware of its existence. Overall 76 per cent of the Symbol users sample identified themselves as being signed up to the Symbol, and four per cent were working towards it. This sample was drawn from a list of organisations known to be signed up to the Symbol, and these responses probably reflect the respondents' lack of knowledge, and possibly a lack of communication throughout the organisation about the symbol.
- Only 22 per cent of respondents in the random sample had heard of the Symbol and three per cent were signed up to it. The smaller the establishment, the less likely was the respondent to report being aware of or signed up to the Symbol.
- The main reasons for not signing up to Symbol use were that there was 'no need' or the 'need had not arisen'. Around 14 per cent reported that the decision was a head office issue and 13 per cent that they did not have enough information.
- A fifth of the Symbol users sample claimed already to meet the criteria and that there was no reason not to sign up. This supports the suggestion that some Symbol users are 'badging' good practice. Nevertheless, the existence of the Symbol can make good practice more obvious. A tenth of Symbol users in

each sample reported that they wanted to make a public statement about the employment of people with disabilities.

- Forty-four per cent of Symbol users felt that Symbol use did affect their practices.
- Over 40 per cent reported that being a Symbol user had not made any difference to the organisation. A number of employers had signed up to the Symbol because their practices already met the criteria.
- Very few respondents reported any difficulties with Symbol use. However, the most frequently mentioned problem was that of ensuring the whole organisation followed the commitments. The fact that a few respondents reported this, possibly supports the point made above about a lack of knowledge amongst some respondents.
- There were also very few suggestions for changes in the Symbol itself or the commitments associated with it. Most respondents with any views wanted more publicity and awareness. A few suggested greater monitoring of Symbol users.

Appendix 1. Sampling Design and Characteristics

A.1.1 Introduction

This appendix examines the sampling and weighting adopted for the present study. It is divided into three parts:

- section A.1.2 considers the target sample design
- section A.1.3 examines the characteristics of both achieved sub-samples, and
- section A.1.4 looks at the weighting procedure adopted and reports on characteristics of the random sample when weighted.

A.1.2 Sample design

The survey consisted of an employer-based telephone survey, lasting an average of 23 minutes, carried out on behalf of IES by Public Attitude Surveys (PAS) Ltd during October/November 1994.

The target sample contained two employer based sub-samples. The first sub-sample, based on a target quota of 1,250 establishments, was drawn from the British Telecom 'Connections in Business' database. The second sub-sample, predominantly organisation-based, consisted of a target quota of 250 users of the Employment Service Disability Symbol. The quota was drawn randomly from the ES's database of 800 such organisations.

This section proceeds by considering the construction of both sub-samples in turn.

Random sample

The primary consideration in the construction of the first sub-sample was representativeness (see Table A.1.1). In order that this be achieved and sampling errors minimised, it was decided in consultation with the ES/ED that progressively larger

Table A.1.1 Target random sample characteristics

SIC	Size categories: 11 to 24	25 to 49	50 to 99	100 to 199	200 plus	Total
Energy/Water Supply	1	2	4	5	10	22
Metal/Mineral Extraction	3	4	7	9	12	35
Engineering	16	18	21	25	31	111
Other Manufacturing	17	19	23	30	32	121
Construction	14	13	13	12	7	59
Distribution/Hotels	85	59	48	42	33	266
Transport/Communications	11	13	16	20	21	81
Business Services	38	34	32	28	22	154
Other Services	64	89	87	80	81	401
Total Sample *(Adjusted sampling fractions)*	250	250	250	250	250	1,250
Total Random Sample *	697	297	140	68	48	1,250

* *ie* based on sample fractions calculated from the Census of Employment 1991

Source: IES survey

sampling fractions be used when sampling larger size bands[1], in order to avoid unreliably small cell counts in the larger size bands (for simplicity, five equal quotas of 250 were set for the five size bands adopted). As a result, smaller establishments would be under-represented when compared to the population estimates, and it was therefore necessary subsequently to re-weight the achieved sample to allow inferences to be made regarding the overall population of establishments.

With regard to the construction of the target sample by sector, efforts were made to minimise the subsequent re-weighting which would be required, by setting sectoral quotas within size bands as close as possible to the population distribution. Agriculture, forestry and fishing businesses were excluded from the survey due to the considerable number of small employers in this category. As this sector accounted for a mere 1.4 per cent of total UK employees (Census of Employment 1991) it was felt that its omission would not affect the reliability of the survey.

[1] Size bands agreed with the ES/ED for the representative sample were '11 to 24', '25 to 49', '50 to 99', '100 to 199' and '200-plus'. It was decided that establishments employing fewer than ten employees should be omitted from the sample.

Table A.1.2 Achieved random sample characteristics, size and sector

SIC	Size categories 11-24	25-49	50-99	100-199	200 plus	Total	% of target sample totals
Energy/Water Supply	1	1	4	3	10	19	86.36
Metal/Mineral Extraction	2	8	5	9	7	31	88.57
Engineering	19	18	25	25	33	120	108.12
Other Manufacturing	18	20	25	34	34	131	108.26
Construction	15	13	12	12	7	59	100.00
Distribution/Hotels	88	63	55	43	35	284	106.77
Transport/Communications	11	13	16	20	22	82	98.78
Business Services	24	20	16	26	24	110	71.43
Other Services	72	93	94	80	82	421	104.99
Total No. of respondents	250	249	252	252	254	1,257	
% of target sample totals	100	99.6	100.8	100.8	101.6	100.6	

Source: IES survey

Symbol users sample

The second sub-sample of 251 organisations was drawn randomly from the Employment Service database of known Symbol users. Little information was contained on the database from which any sort of structured sample could be developed, for example by size and sector. It was decided however, to draw the sample on a regional basis, taking an equal number of organisations from each region, selecting every other record as it appeared on the database, until the required quota was achieved.

A.1.3 Achieved sample characteristics

Looking firstly at the random sample, Table A.1.2 shows the number of responses achieved by size and sector. The last row and column of the table give an indication of how closely the achieved sample fits the broad targets set in the initial sampling frame: for example, the 110 interviews completed of establishments in the business services sector, represent 71 per cent of the target total 154 shown in Table A.1.1. The total number of responses achieved was slightly greater than the broad targets, with the shortfall in some cells made up by marginally higher than target response in others. The fact that the achieved response by size band is closer to target, reflects the emphasis placed on size of establishment in determining overall representativeness.

Table A.1.3 Other achieved sample characteristics, random (un-weighted) and Symbol users

	Random		Symbol users
	Weighted %	Sample %	%
Responses on behalf of			
Entire organisation	–	–	76.5
own region	–	–	4.0
site/office	–	–	19.5
Number of sites			
One site	44.7	34.4	29.1
Two or more	55.3	65.6	70.9
Ownership			
Public	13.7	18.1	35.5
Private	85.3	81.0	53.0
Voluntary	1.0	0.9	11.6
Regional distribution			
one or more regions	–	–	47.0
national	–	–	16.3
international	–	–	7.6
not answered	–	–	29.1
N =	1,257	1,257	251

Source: IES survey

Table A.1.3 presents some further information on the background characteristics of the achieved samples. Regarding the random sample, marginally over one third were single site establishments with less than 20 per cent publicly owned.

The characteristics of the achieved Symbol users sample are reported in Tables A.1.3 and A.1.4. Over three quarters of these respondents answered on behalf of the entire organisation. Referring to Table A.1.4, 66 per cent of the sample were to be found in other services, and slightly over half in the '200-plus' size band. Table A.1.3 shows that over one third of the Symbol users sample were publicly owned. It is in the area of ownership that one of the most marked differences between the sub-samples, in terms of sample characteristics emerges. Symbol users are far more likely to be either publicly owned or a voluntary organisation, with over one in ten claiming to be the latter. This proportion was substantially greater than that reported for the representative sample of only one per cent.

Table A.1.4 Achieved sample size and sector characteristics, Symbol users

	% of sample
SIC	
Energy/Water Supply	1.7
Metal/Mineral Extraction	–
Engineering	3.4
Other Manufacturing	14.2
Construction	2.1
Distribution/Hotels	3.9
Transport/Communications	3.4
Business Services	5.2
Other Services	66.1
Size	
1 to 24	10.8
25 to 49	10.4
50 to 99	10.4
100 to 199	11.2
200+	50.2
Not answered	7.2
(N=)	251

Source: IES survey

A.1.4 Weighting

Due to the construction of the random sample, the achieved sample was subsequently weighted in order that reliable inferences could be made about the population. All data from the random sample presented in the main body of this report are re-weighted in this fashion.

The original random sample frame was constructed using the Census of Employment 1991 for Great Britain, with, as previously discussed, larger size bands having larger sampling fractions applied than population estimates would warrant. To generate the weights, the percentage of establishments found in each cell of the size/sector matrix, based on the population, was calculated. Using these percentages and applying them to the 1,257 cases in the achieved matrix, counts were calculated for each cell, corresponding to the population proportions. The difference between the achieved size/sector matrix counts, and the matrix counts based on the population percentages, gives the weights required. Applying the weights ensures that the proportion of observations in each cell of the size/sector matrix for the weighted sample, is the same as the corresponding proportion generated from the Census of Employment 1991.

Table A.1.5 Sample characteristics, random sample (weighted), by size and sector

	Size categories						
SIC	11-24	25-49	50-99	100-199	200 plus	Total	% of total
Energy/Water Supply	4	2	2	1	2	11	0.9
Metal/Mineral Extraction	10	5	4	2	2	23	1.9
Engineering	44	21	12	7	6	90	7.2
Other Manufacturing	48	22	13	8	6	98	7.8
Construction	40	15	7	3	1	67	5.4
Distribution/Hotels	238	71	27	11	6	353	28.1
Transport/Communications	31	15	9	5	4	65	5.1
Business Services	106	41	18	8	4	176	14.0
Other Services	181	106	49	22	16	373	29.7
Total weighted sample	701	299	140	68	49	1,257	–
% of total	55.8	23.8	11.2	5.4	3.9		–

Source: IES survey

The characteristics of the weighted sample are reported in Tables A.1.3 and A.1.5. Table A.1.3 considers the ownership and site arrangements of the weighted sample. The weighted sample has more single site establishments than the random sample, a finding which one would expect, as the initial sample was constructed in order to ensure a greater number of large firms were sampled than would have otherwise been the case. As far as ownership is concerned, little difference can be observed between the weighted and un-weighted samples. Comparing the achieved weighted random sample size/sector percentages above, with the size/sector proportions for the Symbol users highlights the lack of representativeness displayed in the latter and therefore the care required in interpreting results[1].

[1] The counts reported in table A.1.5 for the weighted sample are rounded up on the basis of very precise weights. This means that the percentage reported of the total may not always generate precisely the same cell count, as rounding differences exist. As such the percentages reported are more precise that the cell counts.

Appendix 2. Previous IES (IMS) Survey — Re-analysis

As mentioned in Chapter 1 above, a previous IES (IMS) survey on disability, carried out in 1993, has been used as a comparison with the current study (Honey, Meager and Williams, 1993). This earlier survey contained 'random' and 'good practice' components. For the purpose of comparison, the random sub-sample of this survey has been re-weighted in order to make it representative of the population at that time. The process of weighting used was the same as for the current study. However, as the unit of analysis used in the previous study was the organisation rather than the establishment, weights were generated on the basis of organisation population estimates provided by Dun and Bradstreet[1].

The original 1993 survey contained 1,116 observations. Taking out the good practice sub-sample, and those random respondents not giving size and sector details[2] left 886 cases to be weighted. Table A.2.1 below gives size and sector details emerging from the weighting process.

The 1993 survey contained organisations with ten or fewer employees, thus a separate size band is shown in order that results in the '11 to 24' category can be compared with data from the present survey. As expected, the proportion of establishments in the largest size band, '200-plus', is much lower than the number of organisations.

A selection of re-weighted tables from the previous survey, including those variables which are most directly comparable with those in the present survey, is included below. It should be noted that the precise values in the re-weighted tables differ from those presented in the original study report (Honey, Meager and Williams *op. cit.*), due to the combined effect of the re-weighting process, and the exclusion of the (non-random) 'good practice' subsample.

---

[1] Dun and Bradstreet's organisation database was the source of the sampling frame for the 1993 survey.

[2] Note that the research instrument used in the 1993 survey was a postal questionnaire.

However, any comparisons between the two surveys should be made with caution. The unit of sampling varies between the surveys. The earlier Survey was based on organisations, while the new random sample was of establishments. In addition, different survey methods were adopted (postal and telephone) and it is difficult to assess what impact this might have had on the responses obtained (see also the discussion in Section 1.3.4 above).

Table A.2.1 Characteristics of re-weighted sample from 1993 IES (IMS) survey, random sample only

	Size categories							
SIC	**1-10**	**11-24**	**25-49**	**50-99**	**100-199**	**200 plus**	**Total**	**% of total**
Agriculture	0	8	0	0	0	0	8	1.0
Energy/water supply	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1
Metal/mineral extraction	7	3	2	1	1	1	15	1.7
Engineering	27	28	12	7	4	4	80	9.1
Other manufacturing	18	44	12	7	4	4	89	10.0
Construction	41	43	8	4	1	1	99	11.2
Distribution/hotels	167	86	21	10	4	4	293	33.1
Transport/communications	26	13	4	2	1	1	48	5.4
Business services	127	50	14	10	7	13	221	24.9
Other services	15	7	3	3	2	2	32	3.6
Total weighted sample	428	283	75	44	25	31	886	
% of total	48.3	32.0	8.5	5.0	2.8	3.5		
% of total over 11	0	61.8	16.4	9.6	5.5	6.8		

Source: IMS Survey, 1993

127

Table A.2.2 Employment of people with disabilities, by organisation size

Size (no. of employees)	% employing people with disabilities	Total (N=100%)
1 to 10	16.4	428
11 to 24	24.1	283
25 to 49	35.2	75
50 to 99	43.5	44
100 to 199	54.4	25
200 plus	83.3	31
All respondents	25.2	886

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.3 Employment of people with disabilities, by sector

Sector (SIC)	% employing people with disabilities	Total (N=100%)
Agriculture *etc.*	0.0	8
Energy/water supply	88.1	(0)
Metals/minerals	43.0	15
Engineering	27.8	80
Other Manufacturing	30.0	89
Construction	16.4	99
Distribution/hotels	29.6	293
Transport/communication	22.8	48
Financial and business services	20.3	221
Other services	27.1	32
All respondents	25.2	886

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.4 Number of employees with disabilities

	% of employers with given number of disabled employees	
No. of employees with disabilities	**Employees with disabilities**	**Registered disabled**
1 to 2	82.9	91.4
3 to 5	10.8	6.1
6 to 10	3.2	1.4
11 to 29	2.3	0.7
30 to 49	0.5	0.2
50 to 99	0.2	0.2
100 plus	0.0	0.0
All respondents (N=100%)	191	168

Source: IMS Survey, 1993

Table A.2.5 Reasons for not employing people with disabilities

Reason	**% of employers giving reason**
No-one with a disability has applied for employment in the organisation	86.0
Some have applied, but not been recruited, on grounds other than their disability	2.9
Some have applied, but not been recruited, due to their disability, which was a barrier for a particular job	2.4
Some have been employed in the past, but subsequently left	12.3
Other reason(s)/don't know	4.0
All respondents (N=100%)	662

NB: totals sum to more than 100%, due to multiple responses

Source: IMS Survey, 1993

Table A.2.6 Perceived problems/difficulties associated with employing people with disabilities, by organisation size*

Size (no. of employees)	% claiming problems	Total (N=100%)
1 to 10	60.8	354
11 to 24	75.6	214
25 to 49	53.8	47
50 to 99	91.2	25
100 to 199	65.9	11
200 plus	61.6	5
All respondents	66.4	656

** Note: question asked only of respondents not currently employing people with disabilities*

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.7: Perceived problems/difficulties associated with employing people with disabilities, by sector*

Sector (SIC)	% claiming problems	Total (N=100%)
Agriculture etc.	100.0	8
Energy/water supply	50.0	(0)
Metals/minerals	66.0	9
Engineering	66.8	57
Other Manufacturing	51.1	62
Construction	87.3	80
Distribution/hotels	70.0	206
Transport/communication	61.7	36
Financial and business services	56.7	174
Other services	69.9	23
All respondents	66.4	656

** Note: question asked only of respondents not currently employing people with disabilities*

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.8 Nature of perceived problems/difficulties associated with employing people with disabilities*

Difficulty/problem	% of respondents claiming difficulty/problem
Types of job/work	72.1
Premises	45.7
Difficult access to premises	30.0
Cost of alterations to premises	18.4
Concern that disabled workers might have increased sick leave	12.8
Cost of special equipment	12.2
Concern about productivity of workers with disabilities	11.0
Difficult journey to work	9.4
Concern about additional supervision/management costs	8.2
Attitudes of customers	7.8
Attitudes of other staff/managers	2.0
Other factors	1.7
N=	440

** Note: question asked only of respondents not currently employing people with disabilities, and claiming problems/difficulties associated with their employment*

Totals sum to more than 100%, due to multiple responses

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.9 Formal policies on recruitment/employment of people with disabilities, by organisation size

	% of organisations with formal policy		
Size (no. of employees)	Written	Unwritten	Total (N=100%)
1 to 10	2.7	7.2	424
11 to 24	0.3	9.1	279
25 to 49	9.5	10.1	75
50 to 99	9.6	28.0	44
100 to 199	15.8	28.3	25
200 plus	34.1	26.4	31
All respondents	4.3	10.3	877

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.10: Formal policies on recruitment/employment of people with disabilities, by sector

Sector (SIC)	% of organisations with formal policy: Written	Unwritten	Total (N=100%)
Agriculture *etc.*	0.0	0.0	8
Energy/water supply	29.9	64.2	0
Metals/minerals	9.6	19.5	14
Engineering	4.3	14.2	80
Other Manufacturing	1.9	4.4	89
Construction	2.3	12.7	96
Distribution/hotels	2.0	8.2	293
Transport/communication	1.1	7.0	46
Financial & business services	9.0	12.7	218
Other services	9.5	16.4	32
All respondents	4.3	10.3	877

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.11: Actively seeking to recruit people with disabilities, by organisation size

Size (no. of employees)	% claiming actively to seek to recruit people with disabilities	Total (N=100%)
1 to 10	1.0	424
11 to 24	0.5	282
25 to 49	1.1	73
50 to 99	8.6	44
100 to 199	7.9	24
200 plus	23.0	31
All respondents	2.2	879

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.12 Actively seeking to recruit people with disabilities, by sector

Sector (SIC)	% claiming actively to seek to recruit people with disabilities	Total (N=100%)
Agriculture etc.	0.0	8
Energy/water supply	23.9	(0)
Metals/minerals	10.5	14
Engineering	5.5	80
Other Manufacturing	2.4	89
Construction	0.5	99
Distribution/hotels	0.5	293
Transport/communication	0.9	47
Financial & business services	3.2	216
Other services	6.0	32
All respondents	2.2	879

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.13 How does organisation seek to recruit people with disabilities?*

Method	% of respondents using method
Specific request to Jobcentre/Careers Office	30.3
Job advertisements welcoming disabled people	22.8
Notify Disablement Resettlement Officer/Disability Employment Adviser	37.7
Notify a voluntary organisations	5.4
Other methods	2.3
N=	19

** Note: question asked only of respondents claiming actively to seek to recruit people with disabilities,*

Totals sum to more than 100%, due to multiple responses

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.14 Experienced problems/difficulties in the employment of people with disabilities, by organisation size

Size (no. of employees)	% experienced problems/ difficulties in employment of people with disabilities	Total (N=100%)
1 to 10	6.9	418
11 to 24	8.0	269
25 to 49	8.0	75
50 to 99	6.5	44
100 to 199	15.4	24
200 plus	20.6	31
All respondents	8.0	861

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.15 Experienced problems/difficulties in the employment of people with disabilities, by sector

Sector (SIC)	% experienced problems/ difficulties in the employment of people with disabilities	Total (N=100%)
Agriculture etc.	100.0	8
Energy/water supply	23.9	(0)
Metals/minerals	4.6	14
Engineering	5.8	80
Other Manufacturing	7.5	84
Construction	7.5	94
Distribution/hotels	8.0	288
Transport/communication	2.9	45
Financial and business services	6.4	215
Other services	12.0	31
All respondents	8.0	861

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.16 Existence of specific disabilities that would prevent a person being employed in the organisation, by organisation size

Size (no. of employees)	% claiming that specific disabilities would prevent employment	Total (N=100%)
1 to 10	50.2	410
11 to 24	54.3	277
25 to 49	41.2	73
50 to 99	56.1	42
100 to 199	53.1	24
200 plus	54.2	30
All respondents	439	856

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.17 Existence of specific disabilities that would prevent a person being employed in the organisation, by sector

Sector (SIC)	% claiming that specific disabilities would prevent employment	Total (N=100%)
Agriculture etc.	100.0	8
Energy/water supply	76.1	(0)
Metals/minerals	40.8	14
Engineering	45.0	78
Other Manufacturing	39.9	87
Construction	63.7	96
Distribution/hotels	55.5	283
Transport/communication	61.7	44
Financial and business services	42.3	214
Other services	59.0	31
All respondents	51.2	856

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.18 Specific disabilities seen as a barrier to employment

Disability	% of respondents citing disability
Disability affecting mobility/dexterity	51.4
Visual impairment	34.5
Hearing disability	15.5
Mental handicap, severe or specific learning difficulties	13.5
Epilepsy	10.4
Drug/alcohol dependency or addiction	9.8
Heart, blood pressure, circulation problems	7.5
Mental illness, nervous disorders	6.9
Depression, bad nerves, anxiety	6.2
Skin conditions, allergies	5.8
Chest, breathing problems, asthma, bronchitis	4.4
Diabetes	1.4
Disabilities affecting the internal organs	1.2
Blood disorders	0.0
N=	439

Totals sum to more than 100%, due to multiple responses

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.19 Specific actions taken to employ people with disabilities, by organisation size

Size (no. of employees)	% claiming that specific actions had been taken	Total (N=100%)
1 to 10	4.4	420
11 to 24	9.9	276
25 to 49	13.7	75
50 to 99	16.6	43
100 to 199	27.9	24
200 plus	39.9	31
All respondents	9.5	869

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.20 Specific actions taken to employ people with disabilities, by sector

Sector (SIC)	% claiming that specific actions had been taken	Total (N=100%)
Agriculture etc.	100.0	8
Energy/water supply	47.8	(0)
Metals/minerals	17.4	14
Engineering	9.7	80
Other Manufacturing	10.0	89
Construction	3.7	96
Distribution/hotels	8.9	293
Transport/communication	5.4	45
Financial and business services	8.6	211
Other services	14.6	32
All respondents	9.5	85.6

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.21 Extra costs associated with employing people with disabilities, by organisation size

Size (no. of employees)	% claiming that extra costs would be associated with employing people with disabilities	Total (N=100%)
1 to 10	33.9	412
11 to 24	50.1	267
25 to 49	35.3	70
50 to 99	48.9	43
100 to 199	50.5	24
200 plus	46.0	31
All respondents	40.8	847

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.22 Extra costs associated with employing people with disabilities, by sector

Sector (SIC)	% claiming that extra costs would be associated with employing people with disabilities	Total (N=100%)
Agriculture etc.	100.0	8
Energy/water supply	41.8	(0)
Metals/minerals	47.1	14
Engineering	38.0	79
Other Manufacturing	49.0	89
Construction	52.7	99
Distribution/hotels	33.1	276
Transport/communication	21.0	43
Financial and business services	44.5	207
Other services	38.8	31
All respondents	40.8	8,476

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.23 Maximum acceptable extra costs associated with employing a disabled person

Gross equiv. annual salary to which person is recruited (£ p.a.)	Average maximum acceptable initial cost (£)	Average maximum acceptable ongoing cost (£)
£8,000	£524.37 *(160)*	£292.29 *(175)*
£15,000	£765.52 *(138)*	£403.55 *(155)*
£22,000	£879.62 *(130)*	£609.66 *(145)*

NB: No. of respondents in brackets

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.24 Whether prepared to spend more for existing employee becoming disabled, by organisation size

Size (no. of employees)	% of respondents prepared to spend more	Total (N=100%)
1 to 10	22.8	343
11 to 24	24.9	230
25 to 49	43.4	65
50 to 99	44.8	37
100 to 199	39.0	21
200 plus	52.4	27
All respondents	28.0	723

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.25 Whether prepared to spend more for existing employee becoming disabled, by sector

Sector (SIC)	% of respondents prepared to spend more	Total (N=100%)
Agriculture etc.	100.0	8
Energy/water supply	80.9	(0)
Metals/minerals	26.0	13
Engineering	23.2	66
Other Manufacturing	33.8	73
Construction	22.5	80
Distribution/hotels	23.0	233
Transport/communication	23.9	31
Financial and business services	33.5	192
Other services	25.8	27
All respondents	28.0	723

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Table A.2.26 Whether sought help, support or advice regarding recruitment/employment of people with disabilities, by organisation size

Size (no. of employees)	% of respondents having sought advice	Total (N=100%)
1 to 10	0.4	402
11 to 24	8.5	275
25 to 49	6.7	73
50 to 99	17.7	44
100 to 199	23.6	24
200 plus	42.1	31
All respondents	6.6	850

Source: IMS survey, 1993

Appendix 3. Telephone Questionnaire

NOTE: This version of the questionnaire has been converted from the CATI version used in the interviews.

QUESTIONNAIRE

The survey involves interviewing a representative sample of employers across Britain to find out about the employment of people with disabilities (*ie* someone with a disability or long term health problem which affects the work they do, whether they are disabled or not)

INTRO Good morning/afternoon. I am . . . . . from Public Attitude Surveys Ltd., one of the country's leading independent research agencies. We are conducting a survey on behalf of the Institute for Employment Studies and the Employment Department.

We are interested in the views and experiences of all companies, regardless of whether they currently employ any people with disabilities.

All your responses will be treated in the strictest confidence, and the results of the survey will not identify individual companies. The interview should take no more than 30 minutes.

QA Could I start by asking what is your name please?

QB **Symbol users sample only**

The interview will contain several questions about your organisation as a whole. Are you able to answer for the entire organisation, or will you only be able to answer for your particular site/region?

CODE ONE ONLY

Can answer for entire organisation

Can answer for own region

Can answer for own site/office

Random sample only

All the questions in this interview will ask about what happens at your particular site/office

---

ALL

Q1A What is your company's main product or service?

ALL

Q1B Which of the following industrial sectors do you fall into?

READ OUT. INTERVIEWER: CODE ANSWER USING INFORMATION GIVEN

Energy/water supply

Extraction/manufacturing of minerals/metals

Manufacturing metal goods/vehicle industry

Other manufacturing industry

Construction

Distribution, hotels, catering

Transport and communication

Banking, finance, insurance *etc.*

Other services

Random sample only

Q2A Approximately how many people are currently employed at this establishment?

IF DON'T KNOW PROMPT FOR BEST ESTIMATE

Random sample only

Q2B Is this establishment part of a larger organisation, or is this the only site?

CODE ONE ONLY

Single site	go to Q5
Part of a larger organisation	go to Q2C

Random sample only

Q2C How many employees are there in your organisation in the UK?

1 TO 99999

Don't know

Symbol users sample only

Q3A Is your establishment the only site in the organisation, or are there other sites?

Only site in organisation	go to Q4
Other sites in organisation	go to Q3B

Symbol users sample only

Q3B Are the sites:

READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY. IF ONE OR MORE REGIONS ASK : Which region(s)?

Confined to one or more regions

National

International

Other (Please specify)

Symbol users sample only

Q4 How many employees are there in this organisation in the UK?

1 TO 99999

Don't know

ALL

Q5 Is your establishment (random sample)/organisation (Symbol users sample) part of the:

READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY

Public sector

Private sector

Voluntary sector

ALL

Q6A Can I just check, what is your job title?

ALL

Q6X Is there a policy on the employment of people with disabilities which covers this establishment (random sample)/organisation (Symbol users sample)?

IF YES, PROMPT FOR WHETHER POLICY IS WRITTEN OR UNWRITTEN.

IF HAS NO POLICY: PROMPT FOR WHETHER HAS GENERAL EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES POLICY.

Yes, written policy

Yes, unwritten policy

Has general Equal Opportunities policy

No policy

Don't know

IF Q6X 'Yes, written policy'

Q7 What is included in this policy?

READ OUT AND CODE ALL MENTIONED. PROMPT: Anything else?

Recruitment

Training and development

Promotion

Encouraging the retention of employees who are disabled

Promoting awareness amongst employees generally

Monitoring of number of people with disabilities

Monitoring of policies towards people with disabilities

Adapting working hours and patterns as necessary

Consulting with disabled employees on their needs

None

Other (Please specify)

Don't know

ALL

Q8 Are there currently any people with disabilities or long-term health problems, whether they are registered disabled or not, employed in this establishment (random) sample)/ organisation (Symbol users sample)?

Yes

No

Don't know

IF Q8 'Yes'

Q9A Approximately how many people with disabilities do you employ?

1 TO 99999

Don't know

Yes

No

Don't know

IF Q8 'Yes'

Q9B And how many of these people are registered disabled?

0 TO 99999

Don't know

If Q8 'Nc'

Q10 There are a number of reasons why an establishment/organisation might not currently employ any people with disabilities. Can you tell me which of the following describe the position in your establishment/organisation?

READ OUT AND CODE ALL MENTIONED

No-one with disabilities has applied for a job

Some have applied but not been recruited, on grounds other than their disability

Some have applied but not been recruited because their disability was a barrier to the particular job

Some have been employed in the past but have subsequently left their job

Other (Please specify)

If Q10 'Some have been employed in the past but have subsequently left their job'

Q11 Are there any particular reasons why no people with disabilities have been employed subsequently?

PROMPT: Why else? CODE ALL MENTIONED. N.B. DO NOT PROMPT WITH PRECODES

No/little recruitment generally/no vacancies

No-one has applied

Previous experience shows that people with disabilities present too many difficulties

None recruited (on grounds other than their disability)

None recruited (on grounds of their disability)

Other (Please specify)

If Q11 'Previous experience shows that people with disabilities present too many difficulties'

Q11X Prompt/probe – What difficulties?

If Q10 'Some have applied but not been recruited because their disability was a barrier to the particular job' or Q11 'None recruited (on grounds of their disability)'

Q12 What was it about the disability that was a barrier to their recruitment?

PROMPT: What else? CODE ALL MENTIONED N.B. DO NOT PROMPT WITH PRECODES

Cost of adapting premises

Not practical/possible to adapt premises

Equipment unsuitable – too difficult/costly to adapt or replace

Nature of the work was unsuitable

Supervision/management costs

Safety implications

Productivity too low

Sick leave a problem

Attitudes of other staff/managers

Training costs

Attitude/temperament of person with disability

Other (Please specify)

ALL

Q13 When you are filling job vacancies, do you actively try to attract applications from people with disabilities?

1 TO 99999

Yes

No

If Q13 'Yes'

Q14 How do you try to attract applications from people with disabilities?

READ OUT AND CODE ALL MENTIONED

Specific request to Jobcentre/Careers Office

Job advertisements welcoming disabled applicants

Notify PACT (Placing Assessment and Counselling Team), DRO (Disabled Resettlement Advisors), DAS (Disabled Advisory Service), ERS (Employment Rehabilitation Service)

Contact with voluntary sector/charity

Use of disability symbol/logo

Contact with CEPD (Committee for the Employment of People with Disabilities)

Contact with local employer networks for people with disabilities

Other (Please specify)

If Q13 'Yes'

Q15 How easy has it been to attract disabled applicants?

Has it been . . .

READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY

Very easy

Easy

Neither easy nor difficult

Difficult

Very difficult

If Q15 'Very easy' or 'Easy'

Q16 Why was this?

PROMPT: Why else? CODE ALL MENTIONED N.B. DO NOT PROMPT WITH PRECODES

Many suitably qualified people have applied

Type of work means that it is easy to employ people with disabilities

Symbol use

Have been very proactive in advertising

Already have necessary facilities

Other (Please specify)

If Q15 'Difficult' or 'Very difficult'

Q17 What difficulties do you have in attracting disabled applicants?

PROMPT: What others? CODE ALL MENTIONED N.B. DO NOT PROMPT WITH PRECODES

No-one applies

Those who apply are not suitable for the job (on grounds other than disability)

Something about the nature of the disability

Other (Please specify)

ALL

Q18 Assuming the minimum criteria for doing a job are met, would you try to interview most or all applicants with a disability who applied?

Yes, try to interview most/all applicants

No

If Q8 'Yes' (*ie* people with disabilities currently employed)

Q19A Do you consult disabled employees on a regular basis about their needs at work?

PROMPT IN RELATION TO PRECODES

Yes – Formal discussion

Yes – Informal discussion

No

If Q19A 'Yes — Formal discussion'

Q19B Approximately how often do you consult disabled employees?

READ OUT

Once a month

Once a quarter

Once every 6 months

Once a year

Less often

Don't know

If Q19A 'Yes — Formal discussion' or 'Yes — informal discussion'

Q19C What methods do you use to consult disabled employees?

PROMPT: What others? CODE ALL MENTIONED. DO NOT PROMPT WITH PRECODES

N.B. If Staff Attitude Surveys, PROMPT FOR WHETHER SEND PERSONAL/NAMED QUESTIONNAIRES TO DISABLED EMPLOYEES OR CONDUCT AD-HOC SURVEYS USING ANONYMOUS QUESTIONNAIRES AND CODE AS APPLICABLE

Informal discussion/we just talk to them

Personal/named questionnaires sent to disabled employees

Ad-hoc surveys with anonymous questionnaires

Staff Attitude Surveys but don't know what type

Focus groups/discussion groups

Trade Unions

Staff or house journals

Annual or other appraisal interviews

Exit interviews (*ie* when employee leaves their job)

Staff suggestion schemes

Other (Please specify)

ALL

Q20 If an existing employee became disabled, would you be prepared to take positive steps to retain them in employment?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

Yes (at this site or elsewhere in the company)

Depends on the job

Depends on the disability

No

---

if Q20 'Yes' or 'Depends'

Q21 What steps would you be prepared to take to retain an existing employee who became disabled in employment:

FOR EACH STEP LISTED BELOW CODE YES, NO OR DEPENDS ON THE JOB/PERSON

Provide special equipment

Modify workplace/premises

Provide flexible working patterns

Employ job sharing

Use home working

Allow for special leave necessitated because of disability

Provide additional on the job support

Train/retrain

Provide Counselling

Q22B There are many different types of disability and long-term health problems, and we are interested in the extent to which it would be possible for you to employ people with each. Please tell me whether or not it would be possible to employ people with the following types of disability.

READ OUT EACH ITEM AND CODE WHETHER OR NOT IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO EMPLOY SOMEONE WITH THAT TYPE OF DISABILITY, USING THE FOLLOWING CODES:

Yes, would be possible to employ someone with this type of disability in all jobs

Yes, would be possible to employ someone with this type of disability in some jobs

Depends on the severity of the disability

No, would not be possible to employ someone with this type of disability

Disability affecting mobility

Difficulty in seeing

Difficulty in hearing

Epilepsy

Mental handicap/learning difficulties

Depression/nervous and mental disorders

Heart, circulation, chest and breathing problems

Allergies and skin conditions

Diabetes

Q22B Are there are any other types of disability which would make it impossible for you to employ someone?

IF YES, PROMPT FOR DETAILS OF TYPE(S) OF DISABILITY

No, no other types of disability

Yes

For each disability it would not be possible to employ people with (from Q22A)

Q22C Why would <disability> make it difficult for you to employ someone?

DO NOT READ OUT. PROMPT: Why else?

Cost of adapting premises

Not practical/possible to adapt premises

Equipment unsuitable – too difficult/costly to adapt or replace

Nature of the work was unsuitable

Supervision/management costs

Safety implications

Productivity too low

Sick leave a problem

Attitudes of other staff/managers

Training costs

Attitude/temperament of person with disability

Other (Please specify)

If Q22C any responses 'Not practical/possible to adapt premises'

Q22D What is the problem with the premises?

(Responses coded separately for each disability)

If Q22C any responses 'Nature of the work was unsuitable'

Q22E What is the problem with the type of work here?

(Responses coded separately for each disability)

If any other disability mentioned in Q22B

Q22F Why would <disability> make it difficult for you to employ someone?

DO NOT READ OUT. PROMPT: Why else?

Cost of adapting premises

Not practical/possible to adapt premises

Equipment unsuitable – too difficult/costly to adapt or replace

Nature of the work was unsuitable

Supervision/management costs

Safety implications

Productivity too low

Sick leave a problem

Attitudes of other staff/managers

Training costs

Attitude/temperament of person with disability

Other (Please specify)

If Q22F 'Not practical/possible to adapt premises'

Q22G What is the problem with the premises?

If Q22f 'Nature of the work was unsuitable'

Q22H What is the problem with the type of work here?

ALL

Q23A Would your establishment/organisation be prepared to do any out of following in order to recruit, employ or retain a disabled person?

Make some changes to working practices that have no cost, such as a change in starting time, working hours, or the structure of breaks Yes/No

Make a minor change to the working environment, such as moving furniture; interviewing and providing accommodation on the ground floor Yes/No

Pay the cost of any adaptations or alterations necessary in working practices, equipment used, the premises or working environment more generally Yes/No

---

If Q23A yes to 'Pay the cost of any adaptations or alterations etc.'

Q23B How much would you be prepared to pay for the cost of making any adaptations or additions necessary to take on a disabled person?

DO NOT PROMPT. IF 'Don't Know' OR 'Depends', PROMPT IN RELATION TO PRE-CODES

Less than £100

£100 – £1,000

£1,001 – £2,500

£2,501 – £5,000

More than £5,000

Depends on person

Depends on disability

Depends on job

Up to Head Office

Other (Please specify)

Don't know

If Q23B 'depends on person/disability/job'

Q23BX Could you estimate? Would you be prepared to pay . . .

READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY

Less than £100

£100 – £1,000

£1,001 – £2,500

£2,501 – £5,000

More than £5,000

Don't know

If Q23A Prepared to pay the cost, etc.

Q23C Would you be prepared to pay more to retain an established employee who becomes disabled than for a new recruit?

Yes, would pay more for established employee than for a new recruit

Depends on the quality of the established employee

No, would not be prepared to pay more for an established employee than for a new recruit

---

If Q23C 'Yes' or 'Depends'

Q23D How much would you be prepared to pay for an established employee?

DO NOT PROMPT. IF 'Don't know' OR 'Depends', PROMPT IN RELATION TO PRE-CODES

Less than £100

£100 – £1,000

£1,001 – £2,500

£2,501 – £5,000

More than £5,000

Depends on person

Depends on disability

Depends on job

Up to Head Office

Other (Please specify)

Don't know

If Q23D 'depends on the person/disability/job'

Q23E Could you estimate? Would you be prepared to pay . . .

READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY

Less than £100 pounds

£100 – £1,000

£1,001 – £2,500

£2,501 – £5,000

More than £5,000

Don't know

ALL

Q24A Which of the following sources of information/advice on employing people with disabilities are you aware of?

READ OUT AND CODE ALL MENTIONED

N.B. IF DON'T KNOW AS DEALT THROUGH HEAD OFFICE, PROMPT FOR WHETHER RESPONDENT IS AWARE OF ANY SOURCES OF INFORMATION/ADVICE FROM HEAD OFFICE AND CODE ALL MENTIONED

DEAs (Disability Employment Advisors), PACTs (Placing Assessment and Counselling Team) (and predecessors, eg DRO (Disabled Resettlement Advisors), DAS (Disabled Advisory Service), ERS (Employment Rehabilitation Service))

MODU (Major Organisations Development Unit)

AtW (Access to work)/Special schemes

CEPD (Committee for the Employment of People with Disabilities)

Local employer networks on disability

EFD (Employers' Forum on Disability)

TEC (Training & Enterprise Council)

None

Don't know

For each mentioned in Q24A:

Q24B Which of these sources of information/advice have you had contact with?

CODE ALL MENTIONED

DEAs (Disability Employment Advisors), PACTs (Placing Assessment and Counselling Team) (and predecessors, eg DRO (Disabled Resettlement Advisors), DAS (Disabled Advisory Service), ERS (Employment Rehabilitation Service))

MODU (Major Organisations Development Unit)

AtW (Access to work)/Special schemes

CEPD (Committee for the Employment of People with Disabilities)

Local employer networks on disability

EFD (Employers' Forum on Disability)

TEC (Training & Enterprise Council)

None

Don't know

ALL

Q25 Have you sought advice, information or assistance on the employment of people with disabilities from any other organisation (apart from those we've just mentioned)?

Yes

No

Dealt with at Head Office

Don't know

If Q25 'Yes'

Q26 From whom have you sought advice/information/assistance?

PROMPT: Who else?

CODE ALL MENTIONED

IF 'Jobcentre' WILL ASK TO SPECIFY: ASK FOR JOB TITLE

Jobcentre

Local authority

Voluntary sector/charity

Other (Please specify)

If Q25 'No' or 'Don't know'

Q27 Why have you not sought any advice, information or assistance?

PROMPT: Why else? CODE ALL MENTIONED

No need for information/no disabled employees/not relevant

Little/no recruitment overall/no vacancies

No suitable jobs available

Have all the information needed

Do not know where to go for information

Other (Please specify)

If Q24B — contact with PACT, etc.

Q28 What was your contact with PACT/DRO/DAS/ERS about?

PROBE FULLY

If Q24B — contact with PACT, etc.

Q29 How useful was this contact?

CODE ONE ONLY

Very useful

Fairly useful

Not very useful

Not at all useful

If Q24B — contact with AtW, etc.

Q30 What type of support have you received from AtW (Access to work)/Special Schemes?

PROMPT: What else? CODE ALL MENTIONED

Payment for alterations to premises or equipment

Payment for special aids or equipment

Payment for communicators/interpreters for deaf people attending meetings, training courses or conferences

Assistance with travel cost to/from work

Payments for adapted vehicles

Communicator service at interview

Payment for personal reader for blind employee

Payment for a support worker

Not applicable as application still waiting decision

Not applicable as application refused

None

Other (Please specify)

If Q24B — had contact with local employer networks or EFD

Q31 Has your establishment/organisation joined any local or national body or network in order to assist in the recruitment, employment or retention of people with disabilities?

Yes

No

If Q31 'Yes'

Q32A What is the name of this body/network?

N.B. DO NOT PROMPT WITH PRECODES. CODE ONE ONLY

Employers' Forum on Disability

Sussex Disability Network

Hampshire Disability Network

Milton Keynes Disability Network

Birmingham Disability Network

Thames Valley Disability Network

Calderdale & Kirklees Disability network

Other (Please specify)

If Q31 'Yes'

Q32B Is . . . . . just concerned with people with disabilities, or is it also concerned with broader equal opportunities issues?

Just concerned with people with disabilities

Concerned with broader equal opportunities issues

If Q31 'Yes'

Q33A How useful has membership of . . . . . been to you?

CODE ONE ONLY

Very useful

Fairly useful

Not very useful

Not at all useful

If Q31 'Yes'

Q33B Why do you say this?

PROBE FULLY

If Q31 'No'

Q34 Why have you not joined such a network?

CODE ALL MENTIONED

None in the area

No perceived need for help on employment of people with disabilities

No management/staff time to spare for network membership

Sceptical of the effectiveness of such bodies

Cost

Didn't know existed

Never asked to

Other (Please specify)

If Q31 'No'

Q35 Would you find a local employer-led body to help and inform you on the recruitment, employment and retention of people with disabilities useful?

Very useful

Fairly useful

Not very useful

Not at all useful

IF Q31 'No' and Q35 'Not very useful'/'Not at all useful'

Q36 Why wouldn't you find it useful?

PROMPT: Why else?

CODE ALL MENTIONED

No perceived need for help

No management/staff time to spare for network membership

Sceptical of effectiveness of such bodies

Cost

Other (Please specify)

If Q31 'No'

Q37 What would you expect such a network to do?

PROBE FULLY

ALL

Q38 Is your establishment/organisation aware of the Employment Service 'double tick' symbol?
PROMPT IF NECESSARY: "A sign with two green ticks which indicates and employer with a policy about the employment of people with disabilities"

Yes

No

If Q38 'Yes'

Q39 Has your establishment/organisation signed up to the 'double tick' symbol?

Yes

Working towards it

No

Don't know

If Q39 'No'

Q40 Why has your establishment/organisation not signed up to this disability symbol?

PROBE FULLY

If Q39 'Yes'

Q41 How long has your establishment/organisation been a symbol user?

PROMPT IN RELATION TO PRECODES

CODE ONLY

3 months or less

3 to 6 months

6 months to 1 year

1 to 2 years

2 to 3 years

More than 3 years

If Q39 'Yes'

Q42 Why did your establishment/organisation become a symbol user?

PROBE FULLY

If Q39 'Yes'

Q.43 What differences (if any) has the symbol made to your establishment/organisation?

PROBE FULLY

If Q39 'Yes'

Q.44 Are you monitoring symbol use?

Yes

No

If Q44 'yes'

Q45 How are you monitoring symbol use?

PROMPT: How else? CODE ALL MENTIONED

Analysing data on disabled in the recruitment process

Monitoring progress of disabled within the organisation

Monitoring use of commitments

Other (Please specify)

If Q39 'Yes'

Q46 Have you experienced any problems/difficulties arising out of symbol use?

Yes

No

If Q46 'Yes'

Q47 What kinds of problems have you experienced?

PROMPT: What others? CODE ALL MENTIONED

Too many applications in general (can't sift through applications to find people with disabilities)

Too many people with disabilities apply

Can't ensure every part of the organisation will follow the commitments

No disabled applicants

Do not always know if applicants are disabled

Conflicts with own equal opportunities policy

Difficult to change the selection process

Other (Please specify)

If Q39 'Yes'

Q48 Did you receive any help/support/advice from PACT (Placing Assessment and Counselling Team) or MODU (Major Organisations Development Unit) in becoming a symbol user and implementing the symbol commitments?

Yes

No

No decision/we've just been told to use it

Don't know

If Q48 'Yes'

Q49 What form did this help take?

PROMPT: What else? CODE ALL MENTIONED

Individual advice

Funding

Help with review

Follow-up contact

Other (Please specify)

If Q48 'Yes'

Q50 How useful was this support?

CODE ONE ONLY

Very useful

Fairly useful

Not very useful

Not at all useful

If Q39 'Yes'

Q51 Where is the symbol used?

CODE ALL MENTIONED

The press and other advertisement for vacancies

Internal job advertisements

Application forms

Personnel manuals

Training-related items

Staff newsletter

Departmental reports

Stationery items

General literature about the company

Product marketing material

Nowhere

Other (Please specify)

If Q39 'Yes'

Q52 Are there any changes you would like to see in the symbol itself, or in the commitments associated with it?

Yes

No

If Q52 'Yes'

Q53 What kinds of changes would you like to see made?

PROBE FULLY

ALL

Q54 The Employment Department is considering conducting further research amongst some respondents taking part in this survey. Would you be willing to be recontacted by another researcher in the next few months?

Yes

No

Bibliography

Employers' Attitudes Towards People with Disabilities, Honey S, Meager N, William M. IES Report No. 245, 1993.

Local Employer Networks on Disability, Maginn A, Meager N. IES, 1995 (unpublished).

The Youth Labour Market, SOLOTEC, and Training Credits, Spilsbury M, Dench S, William M. IES Report No. 277, 1994.

RETENTION OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

S Dench, N Meager, S Morris

Report 301, 1996
ISBN 1-85184-227-6

This report updates a previous IES study, exploring employers' policies, practices and attitudes towards the employment of people with disabilities. The study examines employers' perceptions of the employability of people with various disabilities, and the extent to which they are prepared to accommodate disabled employees. In recent years a number of initiatives have been introduced, aiming to overcome some of the barriers facing disabled employees when seeking employment. This report considers the influence on employers of a number of these initiatives, including the Employment Service 'disability symbol', Local Employer Networks, Access to Work and PACTs.

The Institute for Employment Studies
Mantell Building
University of Sussex
Brighton BN1 9RF
UK

Tel. +44 (0) 1273 686751
Fax +44 (0) 1273 690430

ISBN 1-85184-227-6

9 781851 842278

BEST COPY AVAILABLE